D
356
.L75

Class D356

Book .L75

D356
.L75

CERTIFICATE NOTE-BOOK

OF

EUROPEAN HISTORY, 1814-1848

A Course of Study

CONTAINING

THIRTY-TWO TYPICAL QUESTIONS

ARRANGED IN THE FORM OF

EIGHT ONE-HOUR TEST PAPERS

WITH

FULL ANSWERS, HINTS, AND REFERENCES

ALSO

Brief Survey of the Period
Hints on Answering Questions in History
Suggestive Notes and Queries on Teaching History
Select List of Books useful to the Teacher and Learner
Notable Topics and Sayings of the Period
Short Biographies and a Vocabulary

BY

J. S. LINDSEY.

"*The student is to read History actively and not passively.*"—R. W. EMERSON.

"*Whatever a man's notions of these later centuries are, such, in the main, the man himself will be. Modern History touches us so nearly . . . that we are bound to find our own way through it, and to owe our knowledge to ourselves.*"—LORD ACTON.

Cambridge
HEFFER & SONS.
1902.

All Rights Reserved.

CERTIFICATE NOTE-BOOK

OF

EUROPEAN HISTORY, 1814-1848

A Course of Study

CONTAINING

THIRTY-TWO TYPICAL QUESTIONS

ARRANGED IN THE FORM OF

EIGHT ONE-HOUR TEST PAPERS

WITH

FULL ANSWERS, HINTS, AND REFERENCES

ALSO

Brief Survey of the Period
Hints on Answering Questions in History
Suggestive Notes and Queries on Teaching History
Select List of Books useful to the Teacher and Learner
Notable Topics and Sayings of the Period
Short Biographies and a Vocabulary

BY

J. S. LINDSEY.

"*The student is to read History actively and not passively.*"—R. W. EMERSON.

"*Whatever a man's notions of these later centuries are, such, in the main, the man himself will be. Modern History touches us so nearly . . . that we are bound to find our own way through it, and to owe our knowledge to ourselves.*"—LORD ACTON.

Cambridge
HEFFER & SONS.
1902.

All Rights Reserved.

14384
'02

CLASSIFIED TABLE OF CONTENTS.

A. AIDS TO STUDY.

B. GUIDES TO BOOKS.

Page.		Page.	Bibliographies.
v.-viii.	Introductory Sketch.	3	Teaching of History.
1	Hints on Answering History Questions.	4	Study of History.
8	Formulae in History Questions.		Text-Books, Atlases, etc :
9	Topics of the Period (300).	5	(1) General European History.
10	Chronological Synopsis.	5	(2) Special Period.
11	Contemporary Sayings.	6	Larger and Special Works.
12	Thirty-two Typical Questions.	7	Historical Fiction : British and Foreign.
47	Additional Questions (44)		
48	Vocabulary of Political Terms.	45-46	Biographies, Memoirs, etc.

C. SCHEME OF WORK (arranged according to *periods*, not *countries*).

(i) Periods.	Pg.	Q.	(ii) Subject-Matter of Answers.
I. Reaction, 1814-1818.			
Lodge, ch. xxiv. §§49-56 ; ch. xxv. §§1-6. Fyffe, ch. xi.-xiii., pp. 349-457. Phillips, ch. i.-iii.	13	1	France in Spring, 1814.
	14	2	The Hundred Days : Effects.
	15	3	Metternich's Influence, 1814-1818.
	16	4	Holy Alliance : Development.
II. The First Struggle, 1818-1821.			
Lodge, ch. xxv., §§7-10. Fyffe, ch. xiii., xiv., pp. 457-501. Phillips, ch. iv.-v.	17	5	Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle.
	18	6	The Carlsbad Decrees.
	19	7	Latin Revolts.
	20	8	Troppau and Laibach.
III. Greek Revolt, 1821-1830.			
Lodge, ch. xxv., §§11-18. Fyffe, ch. xiv., xv., pp. 501-602. Phillips, ch. vi.-vii.	21	9	Latin Reactions.
	22	10	Castlereagh and Canning.
	23	11	Greek Revolt : Outside Influences.
	24	12	Greek Independence : Navarino.
IV. Revolutions, 1830-1831.			
Lodge, ch. xxv., §§19-30. Fyffe, ch. xvi., pp. 603-646. Phillips, ch. viii., ix.	25	13	Charles X.'s Accession.
	26	14	French Revolution.
	27	15	Belgian Revolution.
	28	16	Polish Revolt.
V. Drift, 1831-1848.			
Lodge, ch. xxv., §§31-36. Fyffe, ch. xvii., xviii. Phillips, ch. x., xi.	29	17	Mehemet Ali and Europe.
	30	18	French Revolution.
	31	19	Sonderbund.
	32	20	Liberalism : Growth, 1830-1848.
VI. Revolution, 1848.			
Lodge, ch. xxvi., §§1-27. Fyffe, ch. xix., xx. Phillips, ch. xii., xiii.	33	21	Successful Revolt : Central Europe.
	34	22	Restoration : Austrian Empire.
	35	23	Magyarism : Rise and Fall.
	36	24	German Parliament.
VII. National Events, 1814-1848.			
Seignobos, Part I., deals with individual countries, viz., England (2-4), France (5-7), Netherlands (8), Switzerland (9), Spain and Portugal (10), Italy (11), Germany (12-17), Scandinavia (18), Russia (19), Ottoman Empire, etc. (20-21).	37	25	Germany : Constitution.
	38	26	Prussia : History.
	39	27	Russia : Alexander I.
	40	28	Turkey : Eastern Question.
VIII. International Events, 1814-1848.			
Seignobos, Parts II., III. : Transformations in the Material Conditions of Political Life (22), Church and Catholic Parties (23), International Revolutionary Parties (24), Metternich System, 1815-1830 (25); Rivalry between Russia and England, 1830-1854 (26).	41	29	Europe : Territorial Arrangements.
	42	30	Colonies of European Powers.
	43	31	Sea-Power : International Influence.
	44	32	Ideals : National, Constitutional.

PREFACE.

The kind reception given to the first instalment of "Problems and Exercises in English History" (Book B, 1399-1603) seems to warrant the belief that a similar book dealing with European History would be found useful by teachers and students; and accordingly the special period prescribed by the Board of Education for the Teachers' Certificate Examination, 1902, has been selected for the experiment now submitted to the public. The period abounds both in romantic episodes and in suggestive political lessons: it is to the latter aspect that attention has been almost exclusively directed in the following pages. The author has selected for treatment those topics which are both intrinsically important and likely to find a place in a paper on the "outlines" of the period.

The book is not designed, to quote the words of the late Mrs. Sheldon Barnes, "to rob the child of the right to do his own thinking," but to help the "child" to exercise that "right." Practically the help here offered is threefold. The author has tried to pick out the best books to read; to discover what our educational authorities consider our young students of History ought to read about; and to point out, by precept and example, how to utilise the results of this reading. Thus the book is not a text-book, professing to contain everything that anybody need know about the period; but it is rather of the nature of a note-book or exercise-book, intended to encourage and facilitate the habit of taking notes and writing essays on historical subjects. In mentioning books, where materials or notes for such essays may best be found, the author has deemed it expedient to pass over books designed to serve only a temporary purpose, and to give references only to books possessing permanent value or interest. At the same time, his omission to mention any book is not to be interpreted as condemnation.

Little space has here been given to British History; but in the author's companion volume entitled "Problems and Exercises in English History, Book G, 1688-1832," there will be found about a dozen answers on the period 1814-1832 and a fairly full bibliography of British History, both general and special (that is, on the period 1688-1832).

J. S. L.

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS FOR USE.

I. **PLAN OF THIS PAGE.** The Preface states the general object and intention of the book; the Introduction, with its marginal references to the Questions answered in this Series, gives a bird's-eye view of its subject-matter; the Synoptic Table of Contents not only provides a topical index but also suggests a Course of Study; the present page explains the methods adopted by the author or recommended to the teacher and learner of History.

A. Intentions.

II. **FORM OF THE BOOK.** Each page has been made complete in itself, and is as a rule devoted to a single Topic or to closely related Topics; and a large-size page has been adopted in order that a comprehensive view of the Topic handled might be taken at a glance, and also that the book, in its interleaved form, should be suitable to serve as a basis for a note-book, or for lesson-notes.

III. **THE QUESTIONS** do not profess to exhaust the period handled, but they may be regarded as typical, in both matter and style, of the questions usually proposed at our public examinations; they follow the highways of history and seldom deviate into bye-ways; and they are pitched rather above than below the usual standard, because ample material for the easier questions is supplied on the "Topics" and "Formulae" pages and in the Introductory Sketch.

IV. **THE ANSWERS** do not profess to be exhaustive or authoritative: no answer to any historical question can possibly be either. They are mainly intended to form a standard of comparison with the answers worked out by the pupil himself; and, except where matter is enclosed in square brackets, they do not contain details which pupils of average ability could not reasonably be expected to remember. Most of the answers are preceded by "Jottings" such as the student is recommended to make for himself (*see* Hints § 4); and all are followed by practical bibliographical notes to first-hand or good secondary authorities, of which some at least are readily accessible.

V. **THE JOTTINGS** represent the needful preliminary work of collecting and sorting one's ideas, before proceeding to write them out. Something of this kind is quite as necessary in writing essays as in doing sums. Such jottings should be made in practice and could not do any harm in actual examinations: many examining bodies insist on all rough work being shown, and the Government Departments often allow no "scribbling," even on blotting paper, except in the books provided for candidates.

VI. **THE BIBLIOGRAPHIES** at the beginning of the book and the Bibliographical notes at the foot of most of the pages are not meant for the guidance of advanced students or specialists in History, but for students who are taking History as a general class subject. Throughout, the author has borne in mind, that for educational purposes, at any rate during school years, History is not (or should not be) an isolated subject, but that it can and must be brought into the closest relations with Geography and Literature.

B. Recommendations.

The ideal would be that each pupil should make his own text-book; the press of other subjects makes that ideal practically unattainable; it is therefore hoped that this book, and the series of which it forms a part, will render a sound compromise possible by doing a certain amount of mechanical work for the learner and teacher, and leaving him to do the essential work of filling in details *according to his own judgment.*

In each of the Test Papers, into which they are grouped, there are usually some questions of the nature of "bookwork," while the remainder may be described as "riders" of varying difficulty. The bookwork questions should be tried first, as the familiarity of the question will inspire the pupil with confidence to proceed to solve the problems—which require *thought* rather than mere *memory.* Each test-paper is reckoned to require an hour for the working, but it is recommended that only three out of the four questions be attempted.

The *teacher* may profitably use these answers as the basis of lesson-notes—adding in his interleaved copy the illustrative matter, etc., which will stamp his lessons with the mark of individuality.

The *student* is warned against learning by heart these or any other answers. Such memorisation is not only immoral, but also destroys the student's power of tackling "unseen" questions.

The answers to the four questions for each test-paper make up a separate sheet, and these can be supplied loose to teachers who desire to distribute copies to their pupils *after they have themselves worked out their own answers.* The pupil's own answers might well be bound up with these answers and kept for revision purposes.

In this connection the author ventures to make two practical suggestions:—

(1) FOR PRIVATE STUDENTS: that they should compare their own "jottings" with those here given before working out their own answers.

(2) FOR CLASS USE: that teachers should elicit facts and ideas on the subject in hand from the class, sift them out, put the most relevant as jottings on the Black Board, and let the class work out some answers with these jottings before them. An analogous practice in composition is often recommended by teachers of Literature.

In making a selection the author has adopted the principle of giving the first place to first-hand contemporary sources *(where accessible in a form suitable for school use)* for *facts*, and to first-rate modern authorities for the *interpretation of facts.* Mere compilations he has either relegated to a second place or has ignored altogether: there are so many that it would be invidious to choose amongst them. Many books are mentioned in the hope that some at least may be within the reach of every student. It is fatal to trust entirely to any single book in History.

☞ *Attention is called to the fact that many parts of this Book* (*especially the* SELF-TESTING APPARATUS) *can be obtained separately in Leaflet Form, either in single copies or in quantities for class use.*

A Survey of European History, 1814-1848.

NOTE.—This short sketch is intended (*a*) to separate the essential facts of the political history of the period from the overwhelming mass of details necessarily given in even the most elementary accounts of the period; (*b*) to indicate, by means of marginal references, the topics that are handled at greater length in the Answers pages, which form the bulk of the book.

§ I. A Brief Retrospect, 1789-1814.—The French Revolution of 1789 is generally regarded as one of the chief landmarks in European History: indeed, Continental writers often treat it as the dividing line between "Modern" and "Contemporary" History. Beginning with an attempt to improve the internal government of France, French assemblies successively "limited" and "abolished" the Bourbon monarchy of that country, and proclaimed their willingness to help other "peoples" to establish "the principles of the Revolution"—Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. Naturally, this universal revolutionary crusade roused a general spirit of hostility among other states; and from 1793 onwards, France, under her various governments, waged almost continual war with Great Britain, and frequent wars with most of the Continental Powers of Europe. In all these wars, except that against Great Britain, she was successful for twenty years; but the warfare was none the less a severe strain on her resources, and enraged most of the European States. The long Anglo-French struggle (dating back to 1688) was the dominant fact in the closing years of Napoleon's career. Failing to *persuade* Europe to join him in this rivalry, he *forced* the Powers into his system, and, because of their mutual jealousies—specially those of Austria and Prussia—he divided and ruled them. Russia was too vast to treat in this way; but in 1807 the *Treaty of Tilsit* was made between France and Russia, based on common dislike of Great Britain: and the "Continental System" was thereby established, which endeavoured to ruin Great Britain by a universal boycott of her goods. In 1808, Napoleon succeeded by trickery in overthrowing the Bourbon monarchy of Spain, only to find himself face to face with a national resistance such as he had never before experienced. Aided by Great Britain, the "Peninsular War" became a running sore which steadily drained Napoleon's resources during the next five years. The Peninsular Campaigns combined with the Moscow Campaign of 1812, and with the Wars of Liberation in the following year, first to weaken and finally to ruin Napoleon. He repeatedly refused the favourable terms offered him by the Allied Powers; and after they had occupied Paris in March, 1814, they compelled him to make an unconditional abdication.

§ II. Preliminary Survey of the Period, 1814-1848.—Thus the period 1814-1848 begins with the fall of Napoleon; and it is influenced throughout by the facts and memories of the preceding "Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era." Throughout the period, the governments of Europe continually fear the rise of a similar phenomenon, which they believe to have sprung out of "Revolution" and "Jacobinism." These two names are the current terms (in the mouths of those in favour of the *status quo*) for two desires which exist, sometimes apart, sometimes together, in the minds of their opponents. These two desires may be named respectively "parliamentary government," as seen in Great Britain, and "nationalism," or the desire to make the State inclusively and exclusively correspond to a "nation." Thus, there are in every country two parties. The one wishes, from fear of what may follow even the slightest change, to maintain the system both in Church and in State, both internal and international, which was established at Vienna in 1814-5. Specially do they guard against any revolution in France. The other desires parliamentary government, freedom of the press, and other "liberties": it also desires that "States" should be conterminous with "nations," or at least each "nationality" wishes not to be dominated by others. This desire leads to aspirations for national unity in Italy and in Germany, to separatism in Belgium and in the various nationalities of the Austrian Empire. The party of movement, whether "liberal" or "national," is generally anti-clerical. Care must be taken not to identify these parties with sections of society. It is not always a case of "the Kings against the Peoples." Some nations are strongly clerical, *e.g.*, Spain: others are intensely provincial, *e.g.*, the subjects of the King of Prussia. In some countries, *e.g.*, Poland, the cry for "liberty" is raised by nobles, in order that they may still rule their peasant-tenants in the feudal fashion that had for the most part been discouraged by Napoleon. There are also many other such cross-divisions, which make it necessary to study not only the history of individual countries, but also the general characteristics which are more or less common to Europe as a whole.

At first, all governments were "reactionary": even Alexander of Russia was soon converted from his early zeal for "liberty." But in the years 1830-2, Great Britain and

France completed their gradual separation from the more "despotic" governments of Austria, Russia, and Prussia. Finally, in 1848, in all but Russia, the "repressive" system broke down for a moment, even in Austria and Prussia, and Italy revolted against its Austrian "despots." But the forces of revolt did not agree together, and their mutual rivalries worked their common destruction during the years 1849-1852.

§ III. **Reaction, 1814-1818.**—In the spring of 1814, Napoleon fought a losing campaign in Eastern France, and was forced to abdicate. He retired to Elba, Louis XVIII. 1
was established in his stead, and the Congress of Vienna began to put Europe in order. Talleyrand was successfully restoring the diplomatic position of France, when Napoleon upset all calculations by returning to France and making a wild effort to re-establish his power. The campaign ended at Waterloo in June, 1815; and "the Hundred Days" left France in a far worse position in every way than it found her. 2
Suspected by Europe, she was a prey internally to fierce party passions, whose effects were long in disappearing. Meanwhile, Ferdinand VII. was "restoring" Spain, the Diet of the new German Confederation was being established, and, with the support of Metternich, the Austrian Chancellor, the princes in Germany and Italy were succeeding, more or less, in bringing their "estates" back to the system of the eighteenth century. 3
As exceptions to this general reaction, may be noted the conduct of the Duke of Weimar and that of Alexander of Russia, who not only gave a constitution to his kingdom of Poland, but was also trying to persuade Europe to accede to the Holy Alliance, and to base politics on the principles of the Gospel. Neither of his attempts towards Liberalism was successful: Poland disappointed him, and the Holy Alliance was gradually transformed, under Metternich's influence, into an instrument of reaction 4
and repression. The festival at the Wartburg might betray some of the feelings of discontent and desire which usually remained concealed; but, on the whole, Europe appeared to be generally peaceful.

§ IV. **The First Struggle, 1818-1821.**—When the Congress of diplomatists met at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, they could congratulate themselves on the happy 5
inauguration of their method of governing "the United States of Europe" by congresses. France had now sufficiently advanced in reaction to prove herself not dangerous. The foreign troops were, therefore, withdrawn, and France was again admitted to the comity of nations. The minor matters which concerned the Congress were either satisfactorily settled or set aside. But no sooner had the Congress broken up than the murder of Kotzebue alarmed the reactionary statesmen. Conferences were held at Carlsbad and 6
Vienna in 1819 and 1820; and before the German Diet could ratify the measures of repression there decided upon, South Europe was in a blaze. In Spain, Naples, and 7
Portugal, military revolts broke out in 1820; in each case the rebels demanded, and for a time at least obtained, the establishment of the democratic constitution which Spain had had in 1812. In the Conferences of Troppau and Laibach, the Powers decided 8
that Austria should "restore" Ferdinand of Naples; and, owing to the overwhelming military superiority of the Austrian troops, the Neapolitan reaction was easily effected.

§ V. **Revolt in the Southern Peninsulas, 1821-1830:** (i) **Iberian.**—Meanwhile, Spain was a prey for three years to civil war, and accordingly in 1823, France, now completely reactionary under the influence of Artois and the "Congregation," was commissioned by the Congress of Verona to "restore" Ferdinand of Spain. Portugal, 9
owing to its sea-coast and its connection with Brazil and Great Britain, was allowed to go its own course. Canning, now rising to influence in the counsels of George IV., 10
succeeded Castlereagh as Foreign Secretary in 1822; and this ministerial change marked a change of policy, which was doubtless partly due to differences of temperament between the two statesmen, but was still more due to change of circumstances. Liberalism in Europe was becoming more militant, and Great Britain began to stand out, at least to a certain extent, and in so far as her own interests were concerned, as an opponent of the policy of "intervention" adopted by the other Great Powers.

(ii) **Balkan.**—Specially was this change apparent in the affairs of Greece. The aspirations of the Hellenes, long growing, had revealed themselves in 1821 in an attempt 11
on Roumania and in revolts in the Morea; and by the summer of 1822 events had so developed that the Congress of Verona was concerned with Greek events as much as with Spanish. No common action was possible, however, because of mutual jealousies among the Powers. Turkey had called in Egypt to her help. Russia wished to regard Greek questions as her "domestic concern." Austria feared a land extension of Russia, while Great Britain and France in various ways feared her influence in the Mediterranean. Consequently, we have a long drift of diplomacy and war. Meanwhile, the Spanish

colonies in South America had shaken themselves free from the Mother Country ; and George Canning joined with James Monroe, President of the United States (1824) to protect the new "republics" from European interference. By 1827 the Greeks were in despair ; Egyptian troops and civil war among themselves had all but ended their power of resistance, and Capodistrias, who became President of Greece in this year, found an almost hopeless task. But European feeling was at last roused by the Turkish capture of Missolonghi in 1826; and though Russia and Great Britain still suspected one another, they agreed sufficiently to send into Greek waters a fleet which, in October 1827, 12
won the battle of Navarino. The destruction of the Turko-Egyptian fleet changed the fortunes of the war in the Balkan Peninsula. Great Britain and France gradually came to believe in the necessity of Greek independence, and Russia was at last obliged to agree to this, especially as the Western Powers would not allow her to take full advantage of her victories in the war of 1827-9. The *Treaty of Adrianople,* September, 1829, arranged the matters in dispute between Russia and Turkey ; and after Leopold's renunciation of the Greek crown, and long haggling as to boundaries, Otho of Bavaria became king in February, 1833, and the Greek question was settled for a time.

§ VI. The Revolutions of 1830-1831.—Before the Greek question had been settled, the West had witnessed important events which led to the first open breach of the Vienna reconstruction of Europe. After the accession of Charles X. in France (1824), the reactionary forces had, if possible, greater success than in the later years of 13
Louis XVIII. In 1830 discontent had been increased by recent changes in the ministry, and by the evident intention of Charles to establish an absolutist constitution. The middle class revolted, helped by the mob of Paris, and ejecting Charles, set up his cousin 14
Louis Philippe as King of the French. The consequences of this "Revolution of July" in France were many. There were temporary outbursts in parts of Germany ; the *Reform Acts* of 1832 were carried in Great Britain and Ireland ; but specially important were the revolts in Belgium and Poland. Belgium broke away from Holland, to 15
which she had been tied in 1815. The Eastern Powers were comparatively helpless because of the Polish revolt, and after a diplomatic tangle, owing to British fear of French aggression, Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, who had been momentary King of 16
Greece, became King of the Belgians. Meanwhile, Russia suppressed the Polish rising, and finally ended her experiments in governing the kingdom of Poland on special lines.

§ VII. The Period of Drift, 1831-1848.—In the winter of 1831-2, Mehemet Ali of Egypt rebelled against the Sultan of Turkey, began an easy conquest of Syria, and during the next year advanced into Asia Minor. His career developed the hostility between Russia and the Western Powers ; for whereas Great Britain and France in 1833 mediated between the Sultan and his victorious vassal, much to the advantage of the latter, Russia made with Turkey the *Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi,* which promised Russian 17
aid in maintaining the integrity of Turkey. Nothing, however, of importance happened in this matter till, in 1838-9, Turkey attempted to recover Syria from Mehemet Ali, and was defeated at Nissib. Then Russia, Great Britain, Prussia, and Austria joined to assist Turkey, while France was kept out of this "concert of Europe" by her jealousy of British as well as of Russian influence in the East. In 1840 Mehemet Ali lost Syria, and was confined to his viceroyalty of Egypt.

During these years (1830-1848) the Iberian Peninsula was distracted by civil wars : in Spain, Don Carlos was urging his dynastic claims against the reigning Queen, Isabella, with the help of clerical and reactionary forces ; and Dom Miguel was playing a similar game in Portugal. These Levantine and Iberian questions proved a fruitful cause of jealousy among the Western Powers interested in the Mediterranean ; and in 1846 this jealousy was exhibited in the curious diplomatic episode known as the "Spanish 18
Marriages Question." Great Britain thought that France had outwitted her, and had secured a family succession in Spain, and Palmerston was resolved to be revenged. He found his opportunity in the question of the Sonderbund in Switzerland. The Roman Catholic cantons had made a separatist league for the protection of the Jesuits ; and France wished to have the matter brought before the Powers of Europe. Great Britain, however, urged the Swiss Confederate Government to speedy action ; and in 1847 the 19
Sonderbund was ended before Europe could intervene. These diplomatic failures contributed, along with social discontent and growing absolutism, to shake the throne of Louis Philippe. He and his minister Guizot fell in February, 1848.

Meanwhile, in Central Europe there was a steady drift towards change. In 20
Germany, though all was outwardly quiet and Metternich was apparently all powerful, Liberal movements were working underground, and at times gave signs of existence.

Austria-Hungary, too, was becoming discontented, especially since the death of the Emperor Francis and the accession of Ferdinand (1835). The "patriots" took to journalism, and the nationalities of the Austrian Empire were being stirred to life. The Hampach festival of 1832 and the newspapers of Kossuth and Gaj showed, to those who could see, that changes were imminent. In 1846 Austria was glad to use the peasants of Galicia to suppress a rising of Polish nobles; in the same year the accession of Pius IX. to the Papacy roused hopes in Italy; and in 1847 Frederick William IV. of Prussia stirred the waters by the meeting and the failure of his United Diet in Berlin.

§ VIII. "Storm and Stress," 1848.—The year 1848 was marked by almost universal revolt. In January, Palermo broke into insurrection, and won a new Neapolitan constitution. The people of Schleswig-Holstein revolted against absorption into Denmark. In February, Louis Philippe had to flee before the mob of Paris. In March, North Italy, Hungary, and Bohemia revolted against Austrian rule, and even 21
Vienna rose in insurrection, and compelled Metternich to retire from office. Germany began to stir in earnest, and the National Parliament met in May. From this time, however, the forces of reaction began to increase in power, and princes recovered from their first dismay. The King triumphed in Naples; Croat and Serb began to organise themselves against Magyar-German ascendency. Jealousies arose among the Italians, and Sardinia was left almost alone to fight the national battles in North Italy; she was defeated at Custozza in July by Radetzky, who captured Milan in August. Then, 22
while Jellacic was fighting the battles of the Emperor in Croatia, and Windischgrätz took Prag in June, and Vienna in October, the Magyars were running riot under the guidance of Kossuth, and stirring the enmity of neighbouring nationalities. Croatia 23
declared war on them in September, and Transylvania revolted in October. Their pride only rose with opposition, and in 1849 they proclaimed their independence; but, after a long struggle, they were finally crushed by Austria, with the help of Russia. Meanwhile, the German Parliament had led Prussia into a false position in the Schleswig-Holstein 24
question, and its members had wasted months in academic discussions as to the Constitution of the Germany which they fondly imagined they had called into existence. They ingloriously disappeared in 1849. But the end was not yet.

§ IX. A National Review, 1814-1848.—We have thus traced the story of Europe as a whole for thirty-four eventful years; but while it is all important thus to preserve the unity, we must not forget that each country has its own history, and its own characteristics, political and national, religious and intellectual, social and enonomic. Germany was condemned in 1814-5 to a constitution which for many years offered a 25
passive resistance to all change; and even the storm of 1848 failed to do more than show that attempts at unification and reform were as yet premature. Prussia, under her two Frederick Williams, was merely waiting her turn. Her government promised much but 26
performed little, if anything, in the way of constitutional change; but she improved her law and administration and built up the Zollverein or Customs-Union which habituated Germans to Prussian leadership. Meanwhile Austria almost deserved to be called what her minister, Metternich, called Italy—"a geographical expression." France, Spain, and the minor states of the West were struggling towards constitutionalism of the British type. In comparison with the rest of Europe, Russia was stationary the whole period; 27
and Alexander steadily went backward in his treatment of Poland and of European Liberalism. South-eastern Europe had but one development—the establishment of Greek independence. Egypt under Mehemet Ali was a mere disturber of the peace: his am- 28
bitious activities merely illustrated and increased Ottoman weakness and the jealousies of France and Great Britain in the Mediterranean.

§ X. An International Review, 1814-1848.—In order to obtain a complete view of any tract of General History, it must be considered not only according to periods and countries, but topically; and here the natural starting-point is geography. Very little happened in the way of territorial changes: besides Greece, Belgium achieved her inde- 29
pendence and Poland lost hers. Colonial questions, except in South America, were not of more than moderate importance. Great Britain was silently building up her second 30
Empire. This silence was owing mainly to her predominant sea-power, which also 31
enabled her to take part in the problems of the Eastern Question. The reason that such small results accrued from the endless unrest of our period was that reformers had incom- 32
patible ideals. The "nations" wanted unity, inclusive and exclusive; they also wanted Parliaments; and these two could not be attained together. At the end of our period the "good time" was still only "coming."

HINTS ON ANSWERING HISTORY QUESTIONS.

A. Before Answering.

1. *Read the question carefully,* and be quite sure that you clearly understand exactly what is required before attempting an answer. Marks are frequently lost through sheer carelessness, such as mistaking "Henry IV" for "Henry VI," as well as through not clearly understanding the object of the question.

2. *Think before you write.* Don't assume that a question is easy because it appears familiar, nor, on the other hand, that one which seems strange is necessarily difficult. A complex and apparently difficult question can sometimes be easily tackled if cut up into several simple ones.

3. *Think out "method" as well as "matter."* A good method will assist the writer to recall points otherwise forgotten, as well as tend to enhance the value of the answer in other ways. It is not only "what is said" but the "way in which it is said" that attracts attention.

4. *Make a list of the points to be introduced into the answer,* either mentally or on paper; then endeavour to arrange these points in logical order and work them up into a connected essay.

5. *Answer in the terms of the question.* If asked to sketch the political career of a man, don't pour forth details about his babyhood unless they illustrate some point in his political career If you are asked the "objects" of a law, don't merely reproduce the "provisions" given in the text-book But, on the other hand,

6. *Don't be a slave to the wording of the question.* If asked, "What is the meaning of Mortmain?" you will not find it easy to continue your answer if you write down immediately, "Mortmain is —." Much depends upon the way in which you *begin* your answer.

7. *Observe proportion:* as a general rule give *about* the same amount of time and space to each question; or at any rate do not spend so much time over one question that you have to scamp the rest. Remember that no marks are obtained for questions "unanswered for lack of time."

8. *Be especially careful in answering miscellaneous questions:—i e*, questions in which you are asked for "notes" or "what you know" about a number of things You are not expected to set down *all* you know, and your whole answer should not be longer than your longest answer to questions dealing with one point only.

B. While Answering.

9. *Make it quite clear which question you are answering,* not only by numbering your answers carefully, but also by giving a catch-word at the very beginning of your answer Be particularly careful in Miscellanies: *e.g.* if asked, "What do you know about Pitt, Plassey, Poynings and Puritans?" you deserve no marks for such an answer as this:—"A place in India. People who lived in the Tudor period."

10. *Rely upon Reason rather than Memory,* whereby you will be saved from making those unfortunate mistakes which suggest that want of knowledge of the particular point under discussion is not your only weak point.

11. *Tabulate where possible, paragraph always.* Illustrate freely with sketch-maps, tables and drawings, and take pains to arrange your answer so as to give prominence to each separate part by the use of "headings" and numerals. But, on the other hand,

12. *Remember that "Notes" are not "Answers,"* which should be connected, intelligible, and complete in themselves. "Notes" are allowable only (*a*) in tabular matter, (*b*) in filling up odd minutes at the end of your time, when you cannot work out a complete answer.

13. *Don't under-rate the importance of dates*: insert dates when you *know* them, but remember that an omission is less striking than a palpable mistake If you are not *sure* of a date, don't guess figures which, if wrong, will count against you, but say or show that the event of which you are treating is before or after some connected event the date of which you can state with certainty An intelligent approximation is better than a bad shot at an exact date.

14. *Make your main points clear and prominent,* and introduce details only so far as they illustrate these points. The essentials of a good "sketch" and a good "answer" are identical A few significant features grouped intelligently are preferable to "a large amount of reading photographed on a small plate."

15. *Support your conclusions by facts:* don't make unsupported assertions. If asked for the character or policy of a man illustrate your views by his recorded actions or speeches.

16. *Be as brief as is consistent with lucidity;* neither you nor the examiner have time to waste: but omit nothing that is essential to the clear understanding of the subject.

C. After Answering.

17. *Read your answers* before you hand them in: harmonize your statements and dates, and remember that "Nonsense is never right."

18. *Re-write anything which you don't understand yourself.* It is practically impossible to make clear to another that which is not clear to the mind of the writer. You may remember that "there is something about it in the book," but any attempt to reproduce the words of the "book" in an undigested form is not likely to satisfy the examiner.

19. *Cut out all unnecessary adjectives and ambiguous terms, e.g.*, "Catholic," "Protestant," "coostitutional," "legal," "just," "good."

20. *Treat your examiner considerately* and he will treat you considerately. You have to answer only one paper in History: he may have to read many thousand answers. Write legibly; neither crowd nor spread out your writing; leave margins; avoid the historic present; and don't use trite and hackneyed expressions, such as "Clive soon deserted the pen for the sword."

Select Questions.

I. General.

1. What permanent educational value can be claimed for such History as can be taught at school? How far are the results to be obtained by History only? What proportion of school time may be fairly demanded as compared with Languages, Mathematics, and Natural Science?
2. In a school for boys from 14 to 19 years of age, where, on the average, the pupils remain for four years, one lesson a week of one hour, with adequate preparation, is assigned to History. (*a*) What periods would you select for teaching, and on what grounds? (*b*) Construct a syllabus to cover four years for the use of eight forms, remembering that not more than a third of each form will be promoted every term.
3. Give a list of the maps, pictures, diagrams, and apparatus which you think ought to be provided in a well-furnished schoolroom.
4. What is meant respectively by physical, commercial, mathematical, industrial, and historical geography? Say which of these seems to you most important, and why.
5. What are the advantages of "learning by heart?" What use would you make of it in teaching Grammar and History, or in an infant school?
6. What are the advantages and disadvantages (if any) of encouraging the scholars to put their own questions at the end of a lesson?

II. Particular.

7. What is meant by the "heuristic" method of teaching? Briefly describe its procedure, showing how far it can be adapted to History teaching.
8. Show by what means History can be taught in "regressive" order.
9. State what principles would direct your choice of a text-book for pupils over and under 16 years of age. Criticise a few of the ordinary school text-books from your point of view. How far is it possible to dispense with a text-book altogether?
10. What means can you suggest besides the use of a text-book for making the History lesson profitable to older scholars?
11. With elder pupils what written work would you set to be done out of school with the assistance of the text-book? Show by examples the object of such work.
12. How far may a teacher aim at being "interesting"? Of what devices would you make use with this object in view?
13. How may visits to ancient buildings serve to illustrate lessons in English History?
14. Show how a teacher may assist younger pupils in learning and remembering facts.
15. In teaching history, say what use (if any) you would make of chronological tables. Is it better to learn the date before or after the pupil knows something of an event, and becomes interested in it? Give your reasons.
16. Make a list of stories and biographies illustrative of English History, (*a*) from 1066 to 1485, (*b*) from 1485 to 1837, such as you would think suitable for boys and girls about ten years of age.
17. It is sometimes said that one of the best ways of teaching history is by means of biography. Explain this. Name five or six persons whose biography would throw great light on the history of the eighteenth century, and sketch one such biography.
18. Show, by giving a short sketch case, the different points you would bring into prominence in giving a lesson on Alfred the Great to children in the lowest class and in the highest class of a school.
19. In giving a lesson on the Duke of Wellington, show what use you would make of comparison and contrast with any other character in history.
20. Write notes of a lesson on *one* of the following subjects:—

    A. *For Young Pupils* (30 minutes). (*a*) A Mediæval Castle, (*b*) The Conquest of Wales, (*c*) Wolsey, (*d*) The Armada, (*e*) The Revolution of 1688, (*f*) The Union Jack, (*g*) a Shilling, (*h*) The Use of Laws.

    B. *For Elder Pupils* (45 minutes). (*a*) The British Race, (*b*) The Crusades, (*c*) The Hundred Years War, (*d*) Elizabethan Seamen, (*e*) Divine Right of Kings, (*f*) The American Revolution, (*g*) The Expansion of England, (*h*) Party Government.

THE TEACHING OF HISTORY.

A Short Bibliography.

The Teaching of History is treated in (*a*) Special Books, (*b*) General Pedagogical Treatises, (*c*) Occasional Articles and Addresses printed mostly in educational papers For a full bibliography see—

(1)	FLETCHER, A. E.	*Cyclopædia of Education.* [Third Edition].	Sonnenschein	7 6
(2)	MUNROE, W. S.	*Bibliography of Education* ["International Education Series"].	Arnold	8 6
(3)	SONNENSCHEIN, W. S.	*The Best Books.* [D §167]. [D section, separately, 6/- *net*].	Sonnenschein R. *net*	31 6
(4)	WYER, J. I.	*Bibliography of the Study and Teaching of History.*	Amer. Hist. Assoc.	Ann.

(i) *Special Books.*

**(1)	THE COMMITTEE OF SEVEN (Report, 1899).	*The Study of History in Schools.*	Macmillan Co. *net*	2 0

A recent, temperate and well-arranged report, by scholars who are both historians and practical teachers; treats curriculum, methods and current practice in U. S. A., Germany, France, England and Canada. There is also a useful short bibliography.

*(2)	BARNES, MARY SHELDON.	*Studies in Historical Method.*	Heath	2 6

By an enthusiastic teacher, who has exemplified her methods in two books (for teachers and pupils respectively) on General History which are less well known on this side than they deserve to be. Bibliographies and Suggestions (1896).

(3)	HALL, G. S. (editor).	*Methods of Teaching History.*	Heath	5 0

Mostly by American professors and dealing chiefly with University studies in America: not well arranged.

(4)	HINSDALE, B. A.	*How to Study and Teach History* ["International Education Series"].	Arnold	6 0
*(5)	WELLS, JOSEPH.	*The Teaching of History in Schools.* [Summer Meeting Address, 1892].	Methuen	0 6
**(6)	WITHERS, H. L.	*Teaching History in the Schools of the* [London School] *Board* (1901).	King	0 3

(ii) *General Treatises.*

(1) Collections of Essays on Educational Subjects by Various Writers.

*(a)	BARNETT, P. A.	*Common Sense in Education.*	Longmans	6 0

"An introduction to practice." Lectures at the College of Preceptors (1898): History and Geography treated together.

*(b)	BARNETT, P. A. (editor).	*Teaching and Organisation.*	Longmans	6 6

A manual of practice for Secondary Schools. Ancient History by H. L. WITHERS, Modern History by R. SOMERVELL.

(c)	COOKSON, CHRISTOPHER (editor).	*Essays on Secondary Education.*	Oxford Press	4 6

Contains "Teaching of Modern History" by C. H. SPENCE and A. L. SMITH.

(d)	FITCH, J. G.	*Lectures on Teaching* [chap. xiii].	Cambridge Press	4 6
(e)	ROBERTS, R. D. (editor).	*Education in the Nineteenth Century.*	Cambridge Press	4 0

Summer Meeting Extension Lectures, 1900, including "Teaching of History in England" by H. L. WITHERS.

(f)	THREE HEADMISTRESSES.	*Work and Play in Girls' Schools.*	Longmans	7 6

Contains suggestive papers on teaching History by MARY HANBIDGE, ALICE ANDREWS, DOROTHEA BEALE and others.

(2) Manuals of School Management (mainly designed for Elementary teachers): *e.g.* Collar-Crook (Macmillan, 3s. 6d.), Flux (Nelson, 1s. 6d.), Garlick (Longmans, 4s. 6d.), Gladman (Jarrold, 2s. 6d.), Gunn (Nelson, 2s. 6d.), Landon (Holden, 5s.), Salmon (Longmans, 3s. 6d.), Wilson (Nelson, 5s.). Also, "How to Teach History" (National Society, 8d.).

(3) Teachers' Introductions to Manuals and Source-Books of History (usual in U. S. A., apparently unknown in England): *e.g.* Channing* T.-B. (Macmillan, 6s., 8s. 6d.), Colby S.-B. (Longmans, 6s.), Fiske T.-B. (Clarke, 6s.), Hart S.-B. (Macmillan, 3s. 6d.), Kendall S.-B. (Macmillan, 3s. 6d. *net*). The History Department of Pennsylvania University and the New England History Teachers' Association issue pamphlets on the use of original sources in teaching History.

(iii) *Articles and Addresses.*

*BARKER, A.	*Cambridge Junior Local Syllabus in English History.*	E. R. Apr. 1900
BEATTY, F.	*Raw Materials of History.*	S. W. May. 1900
BROWN, W. E.	*Teaching of History.*	J. E. Jul. 1899
*BROWNING, O.	*Teaching of History in Schools.*	R. H. S. 1889
BRYCE, JAMES.	*The Teaching of Civic Duty.*	C. R. Jul. 1893
*CHARLES, R. F.	*Geography as the basis of History Teaching.*	E. T. Jan. 1897
*CHARLES, R. F.	*History Teaching in Schools.*	J. E. Jun. 1895
CHARLES, R. F.	*Use of Historical Romances in Teaching History.*	E. T. Nov. 1897
*CHILDS, W. M.	*Teaching of History.*	S. W. Apr. 1901
DAVIES, A. M.	*Study of Local History.*	S. W., Aug. 1901
*EVANS, A. J.	*Common Exam. Errors: History.*	S. W. Jan. 1901
EVANS, A. J. and FEARENSIDE, C. S.	*A Teacher's Library*: (i) *English History.*	S. W. Sep. 1899
FEARENSIDE, C. S.	*Historical Novels and their Uses in Teaching.*	S. W. Nov. 1900
*FINDLAY, J. J.	*The Cultivation of Patriotism in the School.*	E. T. Nov. 1900
FINDLAY, MARIA.	*First Steps in Teaching History.*	E. R. Oc. Nov. 99
FRAZER, N. L.	*The Use of Historical Fiction.*	E. R. Dec. 1900
KELLETT, E. E.	*The Teaching of Patriotism.*	J. E. Mar. 1900
MALDEN, H. E.	*Commercial History as a School Subject.*	E. T. Jun. 1894
*MALDEN, H. E.	*Historical Examination Papers.*	E. T. Jul. 1899
MALDEN, H. E.	*The Teaching of History.*	E. T. Jun. 1891
MEIKLEJOHN, J. M. D.	*The Teaching of History.*	E. T. Jul. 1892
REILY, E. M.	*Sallèze Method of Teaching History.*	S. W. Dec. 1899
*SEELEY, J. R.	*The Teaching of History.*	J. E. Nov. 1884
WILSON, R. K.	*Reform in History Teaching.*	C. R. Sep. 1896
*WITHERS, H. L.	*The Teaching of History.*	E. R. Dec. 1899

KEY TO INITIALS. C. R.—Contemporary Review (2/6); E. R.—(London) Educational Review (various prices); E. T.—Educational Times (6d.); J. E.—(London) Journal of Education (6d.); R. H. S.—Royal Historical Society's Transactions; S. W.—School World (6d.).

* Asterisks are prefixed to books or papers which especially combine excellence with cheapness ** mark the best.

THE STUDY OF HISTORY.

A Short Bibliography.

I. **The Nature of History** is discussed incidentally in all sorts of places, many of which can readily be found by reference to the Appendix to Lord Acton's Inaugural Lecture. Among set discourses on the subject may be mentioned –

*(1) BIRRELL, AUGUSTINE. *Obiter Dicta*, Second Series. Stock 2 6
Contains essay on "The Muse of History," criticising the "scientific" view of History adopted by Seeley and Mr. John Morley (in paper on "Popular Culture" in *Critical Miscellanies*, vol. III).

(2) BLACKIE, J. S. *What does History teach?* Macmillan 2 6

*(3) BOLINGBROKE, LORD. *Letters on the Study and Use of History.* Ward, Lock 1 0
Quotes with approval the saying that "History is Philosophy teaching by examples."

(4) CARLYLE, T. *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays.* 4 vols. Chapman *ca.* 1 0
Vol. II contains a paper "On History," and vol. IV contains a paper "On History again." Also various reviews of historical writers.

(5) EMERSON, R. W. *Essay on History.* Works: Various Editions

(6) HARRISON, F. *The Meaning of History.* Macmillan *net* 8 6
Explains and illustrates methods of historical study. Includes papers on "The Use of History," "The Connection of History," "Some Great Books of History," "The History Schools," "Palæographic Purism," and many suggestive studies in municipal history.

(7) LECKY, W. E. H. *The Political Value of History.* [A Birmingham Address, 1892]. Arnold 2 6

(8) MACAULAY, LORD. *Miscellaneous Writings.* Longmans 2 6
The essay on "History" is also printed in Bettany's edition of the Essays. There are also some general remarks on History at the opening of Macaulay's Essay on Hallam.

*(9) MORRISON, J. C. Art. HISTORY in *Encyclopædia Britannica* (9th edition), vol. XII.
Ably traces the development of History: distinguishes clearly between "the old or artistic type and the new or sociological type of History."

(10) POWELL, G. H. *Excursions in Libraria.* Lawrence and Bullen R. 6 0
Includes papers on "A Melody of Memoirs," and "The Wit of History."

*(11) STEPHEN, J. F. *Horae Sabbaticae.* First Series. Macmillan R. 5 0
Contains admirable appreciations of such historians as Joinville, Froissart, Commines, and Clarendon.

(12) STIRLING-MAXWELL, W. *Miscellaneous Essays and Addresses.* Nimmo R. 21 0
Includes paper on "Historical Style" by the learned biographer of Don John of Austria.

II. **The Study of History**, mainly as a special subject for more advanced students in the upper forms of Schools and at the Universities. The standard work is named first, the rest being in alphabetical order.

**(1) LANGLOIS, C. V. and SEIGNOBOS, C. *Introduction to the Study of History.* Duckworth 7 6
English translation by G. G. BERRY, with preface by F. Y. POWELL. Arranged in three "books": (a) Heuristic (Documents and Auxiliary Sciences); (b) Analytical Operations; (c) Synthetic Operations. Severely criticises previous works.

(2) ACTON, LORD. *The Study of History.* Macmillan 2 6
Inaugural Address at Cambridge, 1895; weighty in matter but heavy in style; obscure but well worth re-reading till the sense is grasped; good appendix of illustrative quotations. The same historian (who has read much and written little) described "German Schools of History" in the first number of the *English Historical Review*.

*(3) ARCHBOLD, W. A. J. (ed.). *The Teaching of History.* Cambridge Press *net* 2 6
Introduction by F. W. MAITLAND; *Teaching of Ecclesiastical History* by H. M. GWATKIN; *Teaching of Palæography and Diplomatic* by R. L. POOLE; *Teaching of Ancient History* by W. E. HEITLAND; *Teaching of Economic History* by W. CUNNINGHAM; *Teaching of Constitutional History* by J. R. TANNER; *Teaching of History in Schools*—(1) *Aims*, by W. H. WOODWARD, (2) *Practice*, by C. H. MARTEN; *Teaching of History in America*, by W. J. ASHLEY.

(4) ARNOLD, Dr. T. *Introductory Lectures on Modern History* [1841-2]. Longmans 7 6
Dr. Arnold practically introduced History into the curriculum of English Schools. In these University Lectures he traced the purpose of Providence as revealed in History; and his views may be compared with those of other writers on the Philosophy of History, *e.g.* Buckle, Bunsen, Crozier, Draper, Fairbairn, Flint, Hegel, Montesquieu, Ritchie, and F. von Schlegel. [See Sonnenschein, F. §2].

(5) BERNHEIM, E. *Lehrbuch der Historischen Methode.* Leipzig 12 0
Classified summary of ideas in methodology down to 1894.

(6) BREWER, J. S. *English Studies* [ed. H. WACE]. Murray *o.p.* 14 0
Study of History, Study of English History, and New Sources of English History; also review of Green's *Short History*.

(7) DROYSEN, J. G. *Outlines of the Principles of History* [translated by E. B. ANDREWS]. Arnold 4 6
Praised by Bernheim; condemned by Langlois and Seignobos.

(8) FREEMAN, E. A. *Methods of Historical Study.* Macmillan 10 6
Strikes learned persons as "empty and commonplace"; useful to beginners.

(9) FROUDE, J. A. *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, Series i and ii. Longmans. *ea.* 3 6
"Science of History" in First Series; "Scientific Method applied to History" in Second Series.

*(10) SEELEY, J. R. *Introduction to Political Science.* Macmillan 5 0
Regards History as mainly useful in providing materials for Political Science.

(11) SMITH, GOLDWIN. *Lectures on the Study of History* [1859-1861]. Parker *o.p.* 3 6
Oxford Lectures, like those entered under (4) and (12): may profitably be compared with one another and with the Cambridge Lectures entered under (2) and (10).

**(12) STUBBS, W. *Lectures on Medieval and Modern History.* Oxford Press 8 6
A book both readable and valuable, containing 19 lectures and addresses delivered mainly while the author was Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford (1867-1884). Lect. i, Inaugural; Lect. ii, iii, deal with "Present State and Prospects of Historical Study" (1876); Lect. iv, v, with "Purposes and Methods of Historical Study" Lect. xviii, Review of Recent Work in History (1884).

Special Period, 1814-1848 (1).

I. **Manuals of General History:** The following may be selected from the many publications of the kind as giving a good outline for preliminary reading and as showing the place of the special period in World History.

(i) **Text-Books:** the first is mainly a *fact*-book, the second an *idea*-book, the third a *guide*-book (giving good maps and pictures, and showing where to go for further information), and the fourth an *education*-book.

FREEMAN, E. A. *General Sketch of European History.* [pp. 448 : 28 Maps]. Macmillan 3 6
Concise, but difficult reading ; full index ; good chronological table ; no bibliographies.

LAVISSE, E. (tr. C. Gross) *General View of the Political History of Europe* Longmans, N.Y. $1 25
Suggestive : few facts but many good ideas. Essential for the teacher. The French original is cheaper (Colin 3 fr. 50c.).

ADAMS, G. B. *European History : An Outline of its Development.* [pp. 605 ; 135 Ill.]. Macmillan *net* 6 6
By the Professor in History at Yale University. A compromise between the full text-book fashionable in England and a bare chronological summary. Contains sound guidance, arranged in practical form, for further reading in the best books.

BARNES, M. SHELDON *Studies in General History.* B.C. 1000-1880 A.D., 2 vols. Heath 9 6
"An application of the Laboratory Method to the Study of History." "The Teacher's Manual" (3/6) will be found useful by all teachers, whatever the method adopted ; the "Student's Manual" (6/-) contains maps, pictures and well-chosen extracts from "sources," and is almost unique among historical manuals in being interesting without being untrue, and in being thought-stimulating without being above the heads of young readers.

(ii) **Reference-Books:** including an atlas, a date-book, and a biographical dictionary (ranged in order of importance).

PUTZGER, F. W. *Historischer Schul Atlas.* [68 maps : 71 inset plans]. Velhagen 2 9
Very well selected and executed ; but names in German and no index.

PLOETZ, CARL (tr. W. TILLINGHAST). *Epitome of History, Ancient, Mediæval, Modern.* Blackie 7 6
Full and accurate ; arranged by periods, each sub-divided according to countries, and therefore not supplying a synoptic view of events.

HOLE, CHARLES *Brief Biographical Dictionary.* Macmillan 4 6
There are also larger works, in most good libraries, by Cates, Chambers, Cooper, Thomas, Vincent.

II. **Special Period Manuals:** may be divided into text-books and books of reference.

(i) **General Text-Books:** arranged in order of length of period handled. *Ceteris paribus*, Lodge is the most useful book to those who require or can afford only a small good library ; next come Rose and Fyffe ; Phillips is the most detailed of one-volume manuals ; the most readable books—dwelling on general aspects rather than abounding in names—are Andrews and Seignobos.

LODGE, RICHARD *Modern Europe*, 1453-1878. [pp. 809 : no maps]. Murray 7 6
Standard text-book, by the Professor of History at Edinburgh University. Not "interesting" but well-arranged and trust-worthy ; good index and chronological table. The only serious fault in the book is the absence of bibliographies. The period 1814-1848 occupies parts of chapter xxiv.-xxvi , pp. 625-709.

SEARS, E. H. *Outline of Political Growth in the Nineteenth Century.* [pp. 629]. Macmillan *net* 12 6
Treats each country separately, from 1789 till about 1899, in an ingenious and suggestive way. Good select bibliography. Rather a pamphlet in favour of Democracy than a historical treatise.

ROSE, J. H. *A Century of Continental History*, 1780-1880. [pp. 420 : 8 maps and plans]. Stanford 6 0
By an experienced University Extension lecturer, whose later book on "The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era" (Cambridge Press, 6/-), has been very highly praised, even in France. Good outline ; no bibliography.

FYFFE, C. A. *History of Modern Europe*, 1792-1878. [pp 1,112 : 2 Maps]. Cassell 10 6
Standard Work, by an Oxford history tutor. Also sold in three volumes at 7/6 each, the second volume covering exactly the period extending from the Bourbon restoration to the fall of the July Monarchy, March 1848. No bibliographies.

PHILLIPS, W. A. *Modern Europe*, 1815-1899. [pp. 588 : 4 maps]. Rivingtons *net* 6 0
By an Oxford student of history. Begins after the battle of Waterloo, and bisects approximately at 1848 : topico-chronological in arrangement. There is a short bibliography not confined to English books ; and the four excellent maps deal respectively with the nationalities in Austria-Hungary, the Unification of Italy, Europe in 1875, and the Balkan Peninsula, 1878.

ANDREWS, C. M. *Historical Development of Modern Europe*, 1815-1897. [pp. 956 : 3 maps]. Putnam 12 6
By an Associate Professor in History at Bryn Mawr College. This "Student's Edition" consists of the original two volumes printed on thin but good paper and bound up together with separate indexes. The first volume (obtainable separately at 12/6) deals with the period 1815-1850, and includes a necessity which all the other manuals on the period lack—viz., a good introduction. The book is well-arranged and clearly written : it is rather a commentary than a narrative ; and though it is longer than Fyffe or Phillips, it is more truly an "outline."

SEIGNOBOS, CHARLES *A Political History of Contemporary Europe*, 1814-1896. 2 vols. [pp. 907]. Heinemann *net* 20 0
By a Professor in the University of Paris. The original occupies but one volume and is much cheaper, but has no index. (Colin, 12fr. paper, 16fr. bound). Covers the period in three ways : first, country by country (ch. ii.-xxi.), then deals with general social movements (ch. xxii.-xxiv.), and finally with international relations in five periods (ch. xxv.-xxviii.).

(ii) **Books of Reference:** two atlases, and three chronologies.

ROTHERT, EDUARD *Karten und Skizzen aus der Geschichte*, vols. IV. V. (together) Bagel 7mks. 50pf.
Vol. IV. contains 24 maps illustrating German History, 1782-1870 (3mks. 50pf.) ; vol. V. contains 20 maps illustrating non-German history, 1553-1898, including six on 1814-1848 (3mks. 50pf.).

SCHRADER, FRANZ *Atlas de Géographie Historique*, vol. V. Hachette 7fr. 0
The complete atlas (35 fr.) contains 55 large and many small maps, descriptive text and index.

GOOCH, G. P. (Preface by Lord ACTON) *Annals of Politics and Culture*, 1492-1899. Camb. Press *net* 7 6
A scholarly compendium showing contemporary events in Politics and in Culture (including Literature) on facing pages. Fairly full classified bibliography ; elaborate index.

HASSALL, ARTHUR *Handbook of European History*, 400-1871. Macmillan *net* 8 6

MORISON, M. *Time-Table of European History*, 400-1870. Constable *net* 12 6
Date-books showing the events in different countries in parallel columns. The former is the handier, the latter is the more useful.

Special Period, 1814-1848 (2).

III. **Larger Works and Special Subjects:** For principal foreign works, see Gooch, Phillips, Seignobos, etc.

ALISON, SIR ARCHIBALD — *History of Europe*, 1789-1852. 21 vols. — Blackwood — £4 5 0
This is the fullest work in English, and still remains the best available English book on a large scale. The publishers also issue an epitome (7/6) and an illustrative atlas (31/6).

FREEMAN, E. A. — *Historical Geography of Europe.* 2 vols. — Longmans, *o. p.* — 37 6
First volume contains text, explaining clearly the changes in the political map of Europe from the earliest times: second volume contains sixty-five illustrative sketch maps. The work is valuable for changes of frontier, but says little about the influence of geography on history: for which see H. B. GEORGE, *Relations of Geography and History* (Oxford Press, 4/6).

——— — *Four Oxford Lectures* (1888). — Macmillan — 5 0
Two of these deal with "Fifty Years of European History" (1837-1887). Some suggestive general remarks on European history will be found in the author's *Chief Periods of European History* (Macmillan, 10/6), and *Practical Rearings of European History* (Paul, 8/6).

CALLWELL, C. E. *The Effect of Maritime Command on Land Campaigns since Waterloo.* Blackwood *net* 6 0

MAURICE, C. E. *The Revolutionary Movement of* 1848-9 *in Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Germany.* Bell, R. 16 0
"With some examination of the previous thirty-three years"; also list of dates and authorities. Standard work.

LOWELL, A. L. — *Governments and Parties in Modern Europe.* 2 vols. — Longmans — 21 0

LIEBER, FRANCIS — *Civil Liberty and Self-Government.* — Lippincott — $3 50

MAY, SIR T. ERSKINE (Lord Farnborough) — *Democracy in Europe.* 2 vols. — Longmans — 32 0
Ancient and Mediæval history treated very briefly: most of the book is devoted to growth of democracy in modern times, especially in Western Europe.

DICEY, A. V. — *The Law of the Constitution.* — Macmillan — 12 6
Chiefly valuable to students of this period as distinguishing clearly between British and foreign conceptions of "constitutionalism," and for its appendix on twelve French constitutions since 1789.

OMOND, T. S. — *The Romantic Triumph.* ["Periods of European Literature"]. — Blackwood *net* 5 0
Forming volume XI. in Prof. Saintsbury's twelve-volume History of European Literature.

BRANDES, GEORGE — *Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature.* [To 1848]. 6 vols. — Heinemann *ca.*, *net* 6 0
Vol. I., Emigrant (Emigré) Literature; vol. II., The Romantic School in Germany; vol. III., The Reaction in France; vol. IV., Naturalism in England; vol. V., The Romantic School in France; vol. VI., Young Germany. Invaluable.

IV. **Individual Countries:** Besides articles in cyclopædias (*e.g.*, *Encyclopædia Britannica* and *Chambers' Encyclopædia*), and many volumes published or announced in such series as "Victorian Era Series" (Blackie, 2/6 each), "Nineteenth Century Series" (Chambers, 5/- each), "Story of the Nations" (Unwin, 5/- each), "Cambridge Historical Series" (Camb. Press, usually 6/- each).

(i) **France:** no good text-book in English. Best are G. B. ADAMS, *Growth of the French Nation* (Macmillan 6/-), HASSALL-JERVIS, *Student's History* (Murray, 7/6), and JAMES WHITE, *History of France* (Blackwood, 6/-). The best large history in French is Martin (1789-1878, 8 vols.); and there are many party treatises on the period, *e.g.*, by Louis Blanc, Guizot, Lady C. Jackson, Lemaitre, Macdonnell, Lord Normanby, H. Reeve, Thiers.

ADAMS, C. K. — *Democracy and Monarchy in Modern France.* — Holt, N. Y. — $2 50

BODLEY, J. E. C. — *France since the Revolution.* [Best book]. — Macmillan — *net* 10 0

COUBERTIN, BARON PIERRE DE — *France since* 1814, [Bright: well translated]. — Chapman — 6 0

DICKINSON, G. L. — *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France.* — Geo. Allen — 3 6
University Extension Lectures, commenting thoughtfully and suggestively on the course of events; chap. iii. deals with the Bourbon Revolution; chap. iv. with the Monarchy of July; chap. v. with the Revolution of 1848

(ii.) **Germany:** No good text-book in English, but Austria, Bohemia and Hungary have been fairly well treated in the "Story of the Nations Series" (Unwin, 5/- each).

BIGELOW, POULTNEY — *The German Struggle for Liberty.* [*i.e.*, Liberation]. 2 vols. — Harper — 21 0

BRYCE, JAMES — *The Holy Roman Empire.* — Macmillan — 7 6
One of the most interesting and stimulating books on history ever written. The supplementary chapter deals briefly with the history of Germany from the fall of the Holy Roman to the establishment of the German Empire, 1806-1871.

LEGER, LOUIS (tr. Mrs. Birkbeck Hill) — *History of Austro-Hungary* — Rivingtons — 10 6

MÜLLER, W. — *Political History of Recent Times*, 1816-1875. [Mainly Germany]. — Harper — $2 0

SEELEY, SIR JOHN R. — *Life and Times of Stein.* [1759-1830]. 3 vols. — Camb. Press, R. — 30 0
The most important description of the reforms which made possible the present greatness of Prussia.

(iii) **Great Britain:** See J. S. LINDSEY, *Problems and Exercises in English History.* Book G. pp. 17-19.

(iv) **Italy:** besides the writings of Mazzini.

CESARESSO, COUNTESS MARTINENGO — *The Liberation of Italy.* ["Events of our Time"]. — Seeley — 5 0

KING, J. BOLTON — *History of Italian Unity.* [Best]. 2 vols. — Nisbet — *net* 24 0

PROBYN, J. W. — *Italy*, 1815-1890. (Revised and Extended Edition). — Cassell — 3 6

THAYER, W. R. — *Dawn of Italian Independence.* 2 vols. — Gay and Bird — 16 0

STILLMAN, W. J. — *The Union of Italy*, 1815-1890. ["Camb. Hist. Series"] — Camb. Press — 6 0

(v) **Russia:** Besides the popular histories of Poland and Russia by W. R. Morfill, in the "Story of the Nations."

RAMBAUD, ALFRED (translated) — *History of Russia.* 3 vols. — Low — 21 0

(vi) **Spain and Portugal:** the best general histories are: M. A. S. Hume, *The Spanish People* (Heinemann, 6/-) *Modern Spain*, 1788-1898 (Unwin, 5/-), and H. M. STEPHENS, *Portugal* (Unwin, 5/-).¶

(vii) **Switzerland:** there are several small books which are poor; the standard work is by C. Dändliker (translated)

ADAMS, SIR F. O. and CUNNINGHAM, C. D. — *The Swiss Confederation.* — Macmillan — 14 0

(viii) **Turkey and the Balkan Peninsula:** the volumes by S. Lane-Poole ("Turkey" and "Barbary Corsairs,") are good, that by W. Miller ("The Balkans") in the "Story of the Nations" (Unwin, 5/-) is fairly good.

FINLAY, GEORGE — *History of Greece*, vols. VI., VII. — Camb. Press — *each* 10 0

MINCHIN, J. G. — *Growth of Freedom in in the Balkan Peninsula.* — Murray — 10 6

PHILLIPS, W. ALISON — *The War of Greek Independence*, 1821-1833. — Smith, Elder — 12 6

European History, 1814-1848: (3) Historical Fiction.

NOTE.—This list is not exhaustive, nor is it based on personal knowledge of all the books mentioned. The stories best worth reading, as a rule, are those contemporary with the period handled: these are in most cases distinguished by prefixing the date of publication.

I The British at Home and Abroad.

(i) The Peninsular War.

J. Grant — *The King's Own Borderers.*
——— — *The Romance of War.*
Maxwell — *The Bivouac.*
G. A. Henty — *The Young Buglers.*
——— — *Under Wellington's Command.*
C. Lever — *Charles O'Malley* (and Waterloo).
Blackmore — *Alice Lorraine* (South Downs).

(ii) Anglo-American War of 1812.

Michael Scott — *Tom Cringle's Log* (also West Indies).
G. R. Gleig — *The Subaltern* (British).
Bynner — *Zachary Phips.*
Seawell — *Midshipman Paulding.*
G. C. Eggleston — *Signal Boy, Captain Sam, Big Brother.*

(iii) The Waterloo Campaign.

Thackeray — *Vanity Fair* (Waterloo episode).
Conan Doyle — *The Great Shadow.*
R. Buchanan — *The Shadow of the Sword.*
G. A. Henty — *One of the 28th.*
G. P. R. James — *Aims and Obstacles.*
W. H. Maxwell — *Stories of Waterloo.*

(iv) After the Great War.

Sidney Pickering — *Verity* (1815).
R. L. Stevenson — *St. Ives* (French Prisoners).
F. Adye — *Queen of the Moor* (Dartmoor, 1815).
Baring Gould — *Cheap Jack Zita* (Fens Rising, 1815).
Lewis Wingfield — *Abigel Rowe* (Beau Brummel).
George Eliot — *Felix Holt the Radical* (1830).
R. M. Thomas — *Trewern* (Wales, 1830-40).
Arthur Morrison — *Cunning Murrell* (Thames, 1850).

(v) Ireland.

W. Carleton — *The Black Prophet, The Emigrants of Ahadarra, The Tithe Proctor, Reddy the Rover.*
Annie Keary — *Castle Daly* (1847), *Valentine McClutsky, Willy Reily.*
W. O'Brien — *When we were Boys.*

(vi) Social Effects of Industrial Revolution (besides *Shirley* and *Sybil*).

G. A. Henty — *Through the Fray* (Luddites).
E. C. Gaskell — *Mary Barton* (1848).
——— — *North and South* (1855).
P. G. Hamerton — *Wenderholme* (Lancashire and Yorkshire).
H. Martineau — *A Manchester Strike.*
C. Kingsley — *Alton Locke, Yeast,* 1851 (Chartists).
Rutherford — *The Revolution in Tanner's Lane.*
Charles Reade — *Never too Late to Mend* (Prisons).
——— — *Put Yourself in His Place* (Trade Unions).

(vii) Contemporary Novels of Social Life.

1814 Jane Austen — *Mansfield Park.*
1816 ——— — *Emma.*
1821 John Galt — *Annals of the Parish* (Scotland).
1826 Disraeli — *Vivian Grey.*
1841 S. Warren — *Ten Thousand a Year.*
1844 Dickens — *Martin Chuzzlewit.*
— Disraeli — *Coningsby.*
1847 Disraeli — *Tancred.*
— Charlotte Bronte — *Jane Eyre.*
1848 Bronte — *Shirley.*
— Dickens — *Dombey and Son.*
— Disraeli — *Sybil.*
1849 Lytton — *The Caxtons.*
— Thackeray — *Pendennis.*
1850 Dickens — *David Copperfield.*

II Continental Peoples.

(i) Invasion of Russia.

L. Tolstoy — *War and Peace.*
Rellstab — *Polish Lancers.*
C. M. Yonge — *Kenneth.*
Chas. Lever — *Tom Burke of Ours.*
G. A. Henty — *Through Russian Snows.*
De Witt — *Through the Snowdrifts.*

(ii) War of Liberation and Invasion of France.

Fritz Reuter — *In the Year* 1813.
Erckmann-Chatrian — *The Conscript* (1813), *Madame Thérèse.* *The Great Invasion* (1814).
O. V. Caine — *Face to Face with Napoleon.*

(iii) The Hundred Days.

Erckmann-Chatrian — *Waterloo.*
O. V. Caine — *In the Year of Waterloo.*
M. Hartmann — *The Last Days of a King* (Murat).

(iv) Europe after the Great War.

V. Hugo — *Les Misérables* (France) (pub. 1862).
M. Jokaï — *The Green Book* (Russia).
Manning — *Helen and Olga* (Russia).
Patten Sanders — *Black and Gold* (Circassian War).
E. A. Milman — *The Wayside Cross* (Carlist Wars, 1833).
H. S. Merriman — *In Kedar's Tents; The Velvet Glove* (Ditto).
S. R. Crockett — *The Firebrand* (Ditto).
——— — *The Silver Skull* (Richard Church in Apulia).
G. A. Henty — *In Greek Waters* (1821-7) (Greek War of Independence)
E. F. Benson — *The Vintage; The Capsina*
Byron — Poems, esp. *Childe Harold.*

(v) Outside Europe.

Rider Haggard — *Swallow* (Great Trek, 1837).
Marcus Clarke — *For the Term of His Natural Life* (Convicts in Tasmania). [1823)
G. A. Henty — *On the Irrawaddy* (First Burmese War,
—— —— — *To Herat and Kabul* (Retreat from
A. L. O. E. — *War and Peace* Kabul, 1842).
G. A. Henty — *Through the Sikh War.*
H. A. Vachel — *John Charity* (Hants and California).
H. B. Stowe — *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (Slavery, U.S.A.).
W. H. Kingston — *The Young Llanero* (Venezuela).
G. A. Henty — *With Cochrane the Dauntless* (Chile).
A. L. Knight — *A Sea-King's Midshipman* (Cochrane).

(vi) Revolution of 1848.

Freytag — *Debit and Credit* (Silesia).
Spielhagen — *Through Night to Light* (Silesia).
Manning — *Interrupted Wedding* (Hungary).
Roberts — *Mademoiselle Mori* (Rome).
Voynich — *The Gadfly.*
Erckmann-Chatrian — *Man of the People* (Paris).
J. F. Cobb — *Workman and Soldier* (Paris).
M. E. Braddon — *Ishmael* (Paris).

(vii) Contemporary Novels of Social Life.

1831 Stendhal — *Le Rouge et le Noir* (France).
1835 C. de Bernard — *L'Anneau d'Argent* (France).
1838 ——— — *Le Gerfaut* (France). [1815-30).
1839 Stendhal — *La Chartreuse de Parme* (Italy,
1841 Sandeau — *Le Docteur Kerbeau.*
1842 George Sand — *Consuelo* (Venice and Bohemia).
1845 Murger — *La Vie de Bohème* (Latin Quarter).
—— Sandeau — *Catherine.*
1848 George Sand — *Le Meunier d'Angibault* (Socialism).
1851 Sandeau — *Sacs et Parchemins* (Paris, 1848).
1839-45 Balzac — *Comédie Humaine* (Series of Novels).

FORMULAE FOR HISTORY QUESTIONS.

NOTE.—These "formulae," extracted from various examination papers, are meant to be applied to the "Notable Topics" displayed on the facing page. They are suitable either for self-testing by the private student or for class use. They are mostly adapted for *memory* tests, but they can also be used as *intelligence* tests—*i.e.*, to find out whether the subject matter of the text-book and lessons has been *understood* as well as *remembered*. [Variants are inserted in square brackets].

I. General.

Relating to Persons, Places, Events, Things and Terms.

1. What do you know of..... .
2. Give some account of.....
3. When, Where, How, Why, With what result did.....

Not good for written work but useful for oral questioning in order to elicit facts which may then be woven into a connected treatment of some related "problem."

II. Persons.

1. Trace the descent from..... of.....
2. Show the claims of..... to..... ..
3. When and on what grounds did..... claim...
4. Explain exactly the title of..... to.....
5. Compare the claims of..... and..... to.....
6. State the causes of the deposition of.....
7. What difficulties had.....? How did he [she] overcome them?
8. What various causes tended to make..... ... ..popular [unpopular]?
9. What were the chief causes of the failure and fall of..... ....?
10. What was the influence of.....on the political and social life of England in his [her or their] day?
11. Who were.....'s chief advisers during..... ... .? What was the policy of each in respect to.....?
12. Describe the character and policy of.....
13. Explain [Criticise, Discuss] the..... policy of.....
14. Describe the foreign [domestic] policy of.. ...
15. Sketch the political career of.....
16. Give reasons for regarding.....as a great statesman [general, legislator.....]
17. Write a short account of the career of... ..... from.....to..... and explain why..... ..
18. Give a brief account of.....and mention ... ..other great.....in the reign of.....
19. Write a short life [with dates] of.....with special reference to [explaining].....
20. State briefly the connexion of.....with the history of.....
21. Write a life of.....and explain his attitude towards.....
22. Point out the objects of ....
23. Describe the attempts made by..... to.....
24. Why, and in what way did .....?
25. What part did ....play in.....?
26. What important changes in.....were effected by.....?
27. State the successive steps by which.....
28. Enumerate the chief acts of.....which led to.....
29. Give an account of the relations between..... .....and.....
30. What were the chief points in dispute between.....?
31. Describe and discuss the treatment of.....
32. Examine the charges brought against.....
33. Give an account of the trial of.....
34. On what charges were.....executed?
35. What different views were taken by..... as to.....?
36. Why has.....been called "....."?
37. What claims to distinction has.....as.....?
38. On what deeds does the fame of.....chiefly rest?
39. With what great measures or events in [English] history do you connect.....?
40. Whom do you consider to be the greatest..... .....during this period? Give reasons.

III. Places.

1. Where are .....and what is their historical importance?
2. In what parts of the world was the struggle between.....and.....carried on?
3. What were the [English] possessions in.....at.....?
4. What parts of.....were marked by rebellions [fighting, commercial development] during this period?
5. Name (with dates) the principal towns, [cities, ports, places of trade, fortresses, seats of learning, monasteries, manufacturing towns] in.....
6. Describe the principal [civil, ecclesiastical] divisions [boundaries] of.....

Illustrate your answer by a sketch-map.

Draw a rough map of .....to illustrate

7. The principal battles [sieges, campaigns, rebellions, theatres of war] during this period.
8. The principal.....voyages of discovery, [trade routes, settlements].. .....
9. The variations of frontier between..... and.....
10. The political [civil, ecclesiastical, economic, commercial, industrial, agricultural] developments of the period.

IV. Things.

1. Name in order [with dates] the.....
2. Enumerate [with dates and brief explanations] the.....(respecting.....).
3. What were the chief events in.....?
4. What were the chief characteristics of.....
5. Describe the state [condition, circumstances] of.....
6. State the objects, [causes, results] of.....
7. Trace the history [development] of.....
8. What events brought about.....?
9. Summarise [describe, discuss, explain].....
10. Account for.....
11. Explain the grounds, and narrate the course of.....
12. Give an account of the origin of.....
13. What was the difference between..... and.....?
14. Compare.....with.....
15. What was the influence on the political and social life of England of.....?

V. Terms.

1. Explain [Annotate] the following expressions [terms].....
2. What do you understand by..... ....?
3. Describe briefly what is meant by.....
4. Write brief notes [with dates] on.....
5. Illustrate the meaning of... ..... .from the history of the period.

NOTE.—The formal definition of abstract terms is more suitable for grown-up persons than for quite young children, and this principle seems to be generally recognised by the public examining bodies. Still it is clear that even the youngest children must have some knowledge of the meaning of technical terms of History, even though it be unreasonable to expect from them elaborate and precise scientific definitions.

NOTABLE TOPICS IN EUROPEAN HISTORY, 1814—1848.

EXPLANATORY NOTE.—These "notable topics" consist of **Persons, Places,** and **Terms** having memorable associations during this period of European History. Many of them are culled from papers set at various public examinations during recent years: in other words, they have been hall-marked as important by educational bodies whose judgment is usually regarded with respect.

I. 1814-1818.

A. Persons.	B. Places.	C. Terms.
Blücher	Arcis-sur-Aube	Acte Additionnel
Castlereagh	Châtillon	Burschenschaft
Decazes	Elba	Carbonari [able
Hardenberg	Frankfort	Chambre Introuv-
Jahn	Ligny	Charta [Ouen
Kamptz	Orthez	Declaration of S.
Murat	St. Helena	Holy Alliance
Ney	Toulouse	Holy Office
Richelieu	Wartburg	Hundred Days
Talleyrand	Waterloo	White Terror

II. 1818-1821.

A. Persons.	B. Places.	C. Terms.
Abispal	Aix-la-Chapelle	Absolute
Arndt	Barbary	Congregation
Beresford	Cadiz	Cortes
Dessolles	Carlsbad	Diet
Grégoire	Laibach	Free Powers
Pepe	Mainz	Intervention
Quiroga	Novara	Pavillon Marsan
Sand	Rieti	Protocol
Stourdza	Teplitz	Ultramontane
Villèle	Troppau	Vienna Final Act

III. 1821-1830.

A. Persons.	B. Places.	C. Terms.
Ali of Janina	Devernaki	Freedom
Angoulême	Chios	Giaour
Gregorios	Crete	Hatti-sherif
Hypsilanti	Janina	Hetairia Philike
Kanaris	Missolonghi	Janissary
Korais	Navarino	Klepht
Mehemet Ali	Perivolakia	Patriarch
Metternich	Skuleni	Primate
Miguel	Tripolitza	Pragmatic Sanction
Palmella	Verona	Tsarigrad

IV. 1830-1831.

A. Persons.	B. Places.	C. Terms.
Chlopicki	Algiers	Abdication
Constantine	Ancona	Barricades
Lafayette	Antwerp	Barrier
Laffitte	Arta-Volo	Bourgeois
Martignac	Brussels	Chartre Bâclée
Périer	Grochow	Eighteen Articles
Polignac	Iganie	July Monarchy
Radziwill	Ostrolenka	National Guard
Thiers	Rambouillet	Ordinances
Wellington	Warsaw	Twenty-four Articles

V. 1831-1848.

A. Persons.	B. Places.	C. Terms.
Blanc	Acre	Comitati
Carlos	Aden	Jesuit
Gaj	Beilan	Khalif
Gioberti	Beirout	Koran
Guizot	Damascus	Pays Légal
Ibrahim	Ferrara	Sonderbund
Mazzini	Gdow	Spanish Marriages
Palmerston	Hampach	Triune Kingdom
Reshid Pasha	Krakau	United Diet
St. Simon	Nessib	Zollverein

VI. 1848.

A. Persons.	B. Places.	C. Terms.
Archduke John	Curtatone	Agrarian
Batthyany	Custozza	German Parliament
Jellacic	Eider	Kaiserlich
Kossuth	Heidelberg	March Laws
Manin	Kremsier	National Worksh'ps
Molé	Palermo	Plébiscite
Radetzky	Pesth	Quadrilateral
Rossi	Prag	Socialism
Schwarzenberg	Pressburg	Twelve Points
Windischgrätz	Vienna	Young Czech

VII. 1814-1848 (Particular).

A. Monarchs.	B. Regions.	C. Peoples.
Alexander I	Austria	Basque
Charles X	Belgium	Celt
Charles XIV	Croatia	Croat
Charles Albert	Dalmatia	Czech
Charles Augustus	England	Dalmatian
Charles Felix	Galicia	Dane
Christian VIII	Ireland	Dutch
Ferdinand	Lombardy	Flemish
Ferdinand I	Luxemburg	German
Ferdinand VII	Milanese	Hellene
Francis II	Morea	Illyrian
Frederick Wm. III	Netherlands	Italian
Frederick Wm. IV	Peloponnesos	Magyar
John VI	Piedmont	Pole
Louis XVIII	Sardinia	Roumanian
Louis Philippe	Savoy	Ruthenian
Mahmoud II	Schleswig-Holstein	Serb
Nicolas I	Thessaly	Slav
Peter I	Transylvania	Szekler
Pius IX	Venetia	Walloon

VIII. 1814-1848 (General).

A. Families.	B. Treaties.	C. Party-Names
Augustenburg	Adrianople	Bonapartist
Bernadotte	Akkermann	Carlist
Bonaparte	Chaumont	Communist
Bourbon	Ghent	Cosmopolitan
Braganza	Holy Alliance	Eider-Danish
Czartoryski	Kiel	Illyrist
Guelf	Kiutayeh	Jacobin
Hapsburg	London	Legitimist
Hohenzollern	Malmoe	Liberal
Montmorency	Münchengrätz	Nationalist
Orange	Paris	Orleanist
Orleans	Paris	Particularist
Ottoman	Petersburg	Philhellene
Radziwill	Quadruple Alliance	Radical
Richelieu	Quadruple Alliance	Reactionary
Románov	Quadruple Alliance	Republican
Russell	Unkiar-Skelessi	Socialist
Savoy	Vienna	Tory
Wettin	Vienna	Ultra Royalist
Wittelsbach	Vienna	Young Italy

Lindsey, C.N.B. *This page forms part of the C.N.B Self-Testing Apparatus Leaflet.*

CHRONOLOGICAL SYNOPSIS OF EUROPEAN HISTORY, 1814-1848.

EXPLANATORY NOTE.—LARGE ROMAN CAPITALS indicate accessions (the state-name being added in italics); SMALL ROMAN CAPITALS for ministers; **dark type** for battles; *italics* for treaties and constitutional documents; dark upright letters for international congresses and conferences. **B** = Battle; **C** = Capture; **C** = Congress or Conference; P.M. = Prime Minister; **R** = Revolt or Revolution; Rest. = Restoration; *Tr.* = Treaty. Column-divisions roughly follow the usual map conventions.

	WEST.	CENTRE.	EAST.	
1814	Invasion of France (Jan.)	*Tr. Kiel* (Jan.)	Hetairia Philike founded.	1814
	Occupation of Paris (Mar.)	*Tr. Chaumont* (Mar.).		
	LOUIS XVIII., *Fr.* (Apr.)	*Tr. Paris I.*		
	FERDINAND VII., *Sp.*	C. Vienna.		
	Tr. Ghent (Dec.)	Long Diet, *Switz.*		
1815	**HUNDRED DAYS** ...	*Tr. Vienna* (3 Jan.) ...	ALEXANDER, *Poland.*	1815
	BB. Ligny, Quatre Bras	FERDINAND, *Naples.*		
	B. Waterloo	*HOLY ALLIANCE* (Sept.)		
	... ...	*Tr. Paris II.* (Nov.)		
1816	Chambre Introuvable (Fr.)	Algiers bombarded.	... ...	1816
1817	... ...	Wartburgfest (Oct.).	... ...	1817
1818	CHARLES XIV., *Sw.* ...	Constt. Bavaria, Baden.	... ...	1818
	Quintuple Alliance ...	C. Aix-la-Chapelle (Sept.).		
1819	Peterloo: *Six Acts* ...	C. Carlsbad	Kotzebue murd. (Mar.).	1819
1820	GEORGE IV., *G.B.* (Jan.)	... ...	Polish Diet, 1820.	1820
	R. Spain (Jan.)	R. Naples (July).		
	Berri murdered (Feb.) ...	C. Troppau (Oct.).		
	R. Portugal (Aug.).			
1821	... ...	C. Laibach (Feb.)	R. Roumania (Mar.).	1821
	Death of Napoleon (May)	R. Piedmont (Mar.) ...	R. Morea (Apr.).	
	... ...	Rest. Naples (Mar.).		
1822	CANNING *vice* CASTLEREAGH	C. Verona	Massacre Chios.	1822
1823	Sp. Rest. *Monroe Message*	LEO XII., *Pope*	Byron to Greece.	1823
1824	... ...	CHARLES X., *Fr.* ...	Egypt conquers Crete.	1824
1825	Stockton-Darlington Ry.	... ...	NICHOLAS I., *Russia.*	1825
1826	*Const. Portugal* (May) ...	... ...	*Tr. Akkermann* (Oct.).	1826
1827	CANNING, P.M.	... ...	*Tr. London* (July).	1827
	GODERICH, P.M.	... ...	**B. Navarino** (Oct.).	
1828	MIGUEL, *Port.*	... ...	War: Turkey *v.* Russia.	1828
1829	POLIGNAC, Fr. minister ...	PIUS VIII., *Pope* ...	*Tr. Adrianople* (Sept.).	1829
1830	WILLIAM IV, *G.B.* (June)	... ...	... ...	1830
	C. Algiers, R. Paris (July)			
	LOUIS PHILIPPE, *Fr.*	Constt. Germany.		
	R. Belgium (Aug.) ...	... ...	R. Poland (Nov.).	
1831	C. London	R. Rome (Feb.-May) ...	Polish Revolt suppressed.	1831
	LEOPOLD I., *Belg.* ...	GREGORY XVI., *Pope* ...	Egypt invades Syria.	
1832	*REFORM ACTS* ...	Hampachfest	**B. Konieh** (Dec.).	1832
1833	**Carlist War** begins (Sp.)	C. Münchengrätz (Sept.) ...	OTHO, K. Greece (Feb.).	1833
	Factory and Slavery Acts	... ...	*Tr. Unkiar-Skelessi* (July).	
1834	*Quadruple Alliance* (Apr.)			1834
1835	Fieschi's Plot	FERDINAND I., *Austr.*		1835
1837	VICTORIA, *G.B.* ...	ERNEST I., *Han.*	[MEDJID I., *Turkey.*	1837
1839	... ...	... ...	**B. Nissib.** ABDUL-	1839
1840	WILLIAM II., *Holl.* ...	FRED. WILLIAM IV, *Pr.*	*Quadruple Alliance.*	1840
	GUIZOT *vice* THIERS ...	Kossuth comm. journalist	Egypt loses Syria.	
1843	Disruption in Scotland ...	*Sonderbund*	*Const. Greece.*	1843
1846	Sp. Marriages Crisis (Oct.)	PIUS IX., *Pope.*		1846
1847	... ...	United Diet, *Pr.* (Feb.) ...	Poland absorbed.	1847
1848	R. Paris (Feb.)	R. Palermo (Jan.).	... ...	1848
Mar.	Chartist Demonstration ...	RR. Austria-Hungary	... ...	Mar.
May	... ...	*GERMAN PARLIAMENT*	... ...	May
June	French Socialists crushed	B. Custozza (July).		
	... ...	C. Milan (Aug.)		
	[*President Fr.*	C. Vienna (Oct.)		
Dec.	LOUIS NAPOLEON,	FRANCIS JOSEPH, *Austr.*	... ...	Dec.

QUERIES: *Who said it?* *When?* *Why?* *About what?* *Is it true?* *If not, why not?*

I. 1814-1818.

The English would never have deserted me—He will return in the spring—My brother, send me no more soldiers: I have enough—I can no longer recognise France—There will be no peace for the world as long as the French people exists—*Le roi quand même—Plus royaliste que le roi*—Royalise the nation and nationalise royalty—The Bourbons will never be strong till they mount on horseback—I have become a species of moral power in Germany and perhaps even in Europe—The purified *morale* of the Gospel—The Big Bursche—That is not a law but a prophecy.

II. 1818-1821.

I have never seen a prettier little Congress—The Dalai Lama of Vienna—A politician *de semaine*—The Upper House of Europe, whose function is to keep the Commons in order—The coryphaeus of Liberalism—If I lie or break my oath, hurl the thunderbolt of thy vengeance on my head—A combination of Governments against Liberty.

III. 1821-1830.

This damned Eastern Question is like the gout, etc.—Domestic concern—Beyond the pale of civilisation—It had with one blow destroyed the grand work of Peter the Great and all his successors—The system of the Tsar is but a beautiful phantom—Our remonstrance mingled with the air—False as a Byzantine Greek—Bag and Baggage Policy—We have created a new world to redress the balance of the old—The man whom Providence hurled upon England and Europe like a malevolent meteor—An untoward event.

IV. 1830-1831.

Charles X. must take care of this child's crown—I would rather hew wood than be a king on the conditions of the King of England—The moment we give France a cabbage garden or a vineyard, we lose all our vantage ground of principle—Let us imitate the Parisians—Long live Constantine and the Constitution.

V. 1831-1848

A drowning man will grasp at a serpent—From the moment that Russia and England come to an understanding, the peace of Asia is assured—When the sheep are dumb, the shepherd must speak—Austria must germanise Italy—The good Kaiser—Let us sleep upon it—All this because M. Thiers and M. Guizot want to be ministers at any price—A post would be good enough—France is sad: France is bored—Revolt should have its own place in the State—Property is theft.

VI. 1848.

Rather a constitutional hell than an absolutist paradise—From the charnel house of Vienna cabinet a pestilential air breathes upon us, which dulls our nerves, and paralyses the flight of our spirit—Henceforth Prussia is merged in Germany—Long live the Republic and Saint Mark—King Bomba—A crown of mud and wood—*Italia fara da se.*

VII. 1814-1848 (Particular).

The French play with liberty: it is a more serious matter when the Germans add to enthusiasm, perseverance—Italy is a geographical expression—We have on our hands a sick man—I deceive myself if the history of Russia does not begin where the romance of Russia ends—The Turk does not count his enemies—It is of European importance that Germany should be united by a bond that can resist the demands of the moment—What is the German Fatherland? As far as the German tongue is heard—The general and European discussion of these questions will be in the British Parliament.

VIII. 1814-1848 (General).

A lever is necessary to lift the world to the level of the cosmopolitan idea; and this lever is to be found in the idea of nationality—Nationality is the first condition of humanity, as the body is the condition of the soul—Nations cannot afford to be chivalrous or romantic—*Après nous le déluge*—The King has no powers other than those formally assigned to him by the Constitution and by the laws made in accordance therewith—To swear to maintain freedom of religious opinion and equal protection for all forms of worship is to swear to maintain error as truth—Man shall be no longer exploited by man—Waterloo did more than any other battle that I know of towards the true object of all battles, the peace of the world—To end the Revolution the principle of Legitimacy must triumph everywhere without exception.

EUROPEAN HISTORY, 1814-1848.

Thirty-Two Questions arranged in eight "hour" Test-Papers.

Ref. No.

PERIOD I. 1814-1818.

1 1. Describe and account for the condition of France in the spring of 1814.
2 2. What changes did Napoleon's Hundred Days make in the internal conditions and the international position of France?
3 3. What was the extent of Metternich's influence in the years 1814 to 1818?
4 4. What was the Holy Alliance? Describe the system to which this name was afterwards applied.

PERIOD II. 1818-1821.

5 1. What were the various results of the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle?
6 2. Summarise the results, on German institutions, of the Conferences of Carlsbad and Vienna.
7 3. Describe briefly the objects and the methods of revolt in Latin Europe in 1820.
8 4. What were the principles of the various Powers as developed at Troppau and Laibach?

PERIOD III. 1821-1830.

9 1. Why did the revolt in Portugal succeed, while those of Spain and Naples failed? How far was the result owing to differences among the Powers?
10 2. What was the difference between the policies of Castlereagh and Canning? How far was it merely apparent, being due to circumstances more than intention?
11 3. With what aspirations and by what methods did the Greeks struggle for independence? What part did Ali Pasha of Janina and Mehemet Ali respectively play in the struggle?
12 4. Describe the international complications which led to the Battle of Navarino. What was the result of the battle?

PERIOD IV. 1830-1831.

13 1. What difference, if any, did the accession of Charles X. make in the internal affairs of France?
14 2. What were the forces that overthrew Charles X.? What forces set up Louis Philippe?
15 3. What were the causes, and what the consequences, of the Belgian revolt of 1830?
16 4. What chances of success had the Poles in 1830? How did their rising and the Belgian revolt affect one another?

PERIOD V. 1831-1848.

17 1. How did the career of Mehemet Ali affect the relations between Russia, Great Britain and France during the thirties of the nineteenth century?
18 2. What was the question of the "Spanish marriages"? What other causes led to the fall of Louis Philippe?
19 3. Summarise the story of the Sonderbund in both its internal and its external aspects.
20 4. Trace the growth of "Liberal" thought from 1830 to 1848. What were the principal manifestations thereof?

PERIOD VI. 1848.

21 1. How far did the Revolution of 1848 succeed (*a*) in the Austrian Empire, (*b*) in Italy, (*c*) in Germany? At what point of time did it culminate?
22 2. What did Radetzky, Windischgrätz, and Jellacic, respectively, do towards the reaction of 1848?
23 3. What were the causes (*a*) of the Magyar success in 1848 and (*b*) of the subsequent failure?
24 4. Account for the failure of the German Parliament and mention the chief incidents in its career.

PERIOD VII. 1814-1848 (Particular).

25 1. Tell the history of the German Constitution, 1814-1848.
26 2. Trace carefully the chief events of Prussian history, 1814-1848, (*a*) internal, (*b*) external. Had the change of sovereigns any effect?
27 3. Discuss the character of Alexander I., illustrating your answer from his history.
28 4. In what ways did the Eastern Question chiefly affect European politics for the twenty years after the Treaty of Adrianople?

PERIOD VIII. 1814-1848 (General).

29 1. What were the territorial arrangements of 1814-1815? What changes in them had taken place by the end of 1848?
30 2. What European Powers had colonies in the years 1814-1848? What effect did their possession have on European politics?
31 3. What illustrations does the period 1814-1848 afford of the importance of Sea Power in international politics?
32 4. Distinguish between "nationalism" and "constitutional government." Why were these not always compatible?

I. **Question 1.** *Describe and account for the condition of France in the spring of 1814.*

II. **Jottings.** War between France and Great Britain, 1793-1814 (*Peace of Amiens,* 1802-3). *Treaty of Tilsit,* 1807, an alliance of the Emperor Napoleon, master of Western Europe, with Alexander of Russia, master of Eastern Europe, for the destruction, military and commercial, of Great Britain. 1808, began the national Spanish revolt against France, which was helped by Great Britain, and culminated in 1813-4, with the expulsion of France from the Peninsula. 1812, France and Russia quarrelled, and Napoleon invaded and retreated from Russia. 1813, in the spring, Prussia enthusiastically, and in August, Austria, more cautiously, joined Russia against France. In October were fought the great battles round Leipzig, etc., and Napoleon returned to France. The Allies entered France in January, 1814, by which time Wellington, too, was over the Pyrenees. After a campaign in Eastern France and futile negotiations, the Allies entered Paris, where they found Louis XVIII. already installed by Talleyrand's statesmanship.

III. **Answer.** It will be easier to reverse the order suggested in the question by "accounting for" the condition of France early in 1814 before trying to "describe" it.

(i) ANTECEDENTS. We need not go further back than 1807 for the effective antecedents of the condition of France in 1814. In 1807, Napoleon persuaded Russia at Tilsit, and began to compel Spain, to accept the "Continental System" which he had devised against Great Britain. The attempt at once roused a national resistance in Spain, which Great Britain supported, and soon began to chafe Russia. In 1812, Russia could bear the burden of the Continental System no longer, and "revolted." Napoleon invaded the country and, by a series of blunders, incurred the famous disaster known as the Retreat from Moscow. Prussia immediately took advantage of the loss of the Grand Army to revolt in turn against the Napoleonic yoke; and in August, after long hesitation and diplomacy, Austria, despite her marriage connexion with Napoleon, threw in her lot against France. Appeal was made by Prussia and, in a far less degree, by Austria to German national feeling; and the result was the great campaign of the autumn of 1813, culminating in the fierce and continued fighting in Saxony.

(ii) CONDITION IN 1814. Napoleon, at length overwhelmed by force of numbers, retreated to the Rhine; and in January, 1814, the Allies, Russia, Prussia and Austria, stood on French soil. Meanwhile, Wellington had driven the French across the Pyrenees and had also invaded France. Napoleon fought in Eastern France a spring campaign, which arouses the admiration of military critics. He had the benefit of fighting on "interior lines," but this was more than balanced by three great disadvantages. Firstly, the invasion of France ruined his prestige in France; and he had long ago said that to keep his position "I must remain great, glorious, admired." Secondly, he had an exaggerated disbelief in the union of the Allies. And thirdly, by leaving his garrisons in the fortresses of Germany, Napoleon had deprived himself of the services of many of his veterans; and consequently he had to fight the campaign of 1814 with newly-raised conscripts. The Châtillon negotiations fell through in February, and Napoleon's eastward march to cut off the Allies from their base failed to stop their advance on Paris.

When the Allies entered Paris on 31 March, they found Talleyrand already preparing to install Louis XVIII.; and France was thus saved, for the present, from the disgrace of having their King, at least obviously, forced upon them from abroad. Napoleon would still have continued fighting, but his marshals refused to prolong what they regarded as a useless struggle. Napoleon was compelled to abdicate, and he was allowed to retire to Elba with the title of "Emperor." The then slowness of communication, which forms an essential feature in "the condition of France" (and of all other countries) in 1814, is well illustrated by the fact that Wellington won his last victory over Soult at Toulouse without knowing that the northern war had been practically ended by the fall of Paris ten days before.

IV. **References.** G. L. Dickinson, *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France,* and A. Weir, *Historical Basis of Modern Europe,* are useful books for filling up or accentuating the above outline.

(i) TEXT-BOOKS (in order of length). Lodge, C. M. Andrews, Fyffe, Morse Stephens, Rose, Gould's Abridgment of Alison. Also the short books on Napoleon by Seeley, and by W. O'Connor Morris.

(ii) STANDARD WORKS. Alison (vol. xii.) gives the fullest account; Thiers, *History of the Consulate and Empire* (translated), Sir W. Napier, *Peninsular War* (Colby § 111 gives a capital extract); Poultney Bigelow, *German Struggle for Liberty;* Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein.* Also Memoirs by Fouché, Marbot (excellent reading), and Talleyrand. W. H. Fitchett, *How England Saved Europe* (4 vols.) and *Wellington's Men,* may be described as "standard works" for young readers.

(iii) MILITARY BOOKS. Wolseley, *Decline and Fall of Napoleon;* Sir Edward Hamley, *Operations of War;* H. Houssaye, *1814.* Many suggestive remarks will be found in the more generally useful books, T. M. Maguire, *Military Geography* (Cambridge Press), and especially H. B. George, *Relations of Geography and History* (Oxford Press).

(iv) FICTION. Erckmann-Chatrian, *The Conscript* (1813), *The Great Invasion* (France); Fritz Reuter, *In the Year 1813;* O. V. Caine, *Face to Face with Napoleon* (Germany, 1813); Charles Lever, *Tom Burke of Ours* (Russia, etc.); Grant, *Romance of War* (Peninsula); Tolstoy, *War and Peace* (Russia, 1812); G. A. Henty, *Under Wellington's Command* and *The Young Buglers* (Peninsula), *Through Russian Snows* (1812).

I. Question 2. *What changes did Napoleon's Hundred Days make in the internal conditions and the international position of France?*

II. **Jottings.** (i) *Internal conditions.* In April, 1814, Louis XVIII. (Bourbon) was chosen to the French Kingship by the Senate; in 1815, he came back "in the baggage" of the Allies. The peace of 1814 had released from garrison duty Napoleon's veterans. These were now in France, and might rally again, as in 1815. The "White Terror," and other marks of ultra-Royalism: dismissal of Fouché and Talleyrand, execution of Ney and others.

(ii) *International position.* Talleyrand's diplomacy at Vienna, 1814, restoring French prestige through the jealousy of the Powers, great and small. This prestige was all lost with Napoleon's return. The "First" *Treaty of Paris* had restored France to the boundaries of 1792, and had even added small parts of Savoy and certain positions on its northern and eastern borders. The "Second" *Treaty of Paris* took most of these gains away. Other points of comparison between the treaties: France was more suspected by the Powers; this further reacted on her internal conditions, for Louis was between two stools—the Powers and the French people; a very difficult position.

III. Answer. (i) INTERNAL CONDITION OF FRANCE. Napoleon's return from Elba changed an apparently spontaneous restoration of the Bourbons into a re-establishment of the old monarchy by means of foreign armies—the very circumstance against which France had begun fighting in 1792. The "Hundred Days" changed what might have been a moderate restoration into a violent party strife. They gave to Napoleon's veterans a taste of what might befall again if only the Emperor were ever to return. Long years after they gave to another Napoleon, trading on his uncle's name, more chances for his ambition. Though it is partly conjectural, we may attribute to the "Hundred Days" the events of the "White Terror": it must have influenced some, at least, of the ferocity of the ultra-Royalism of the "*chambre introuvable,*" and it certainly led to the execution of Ney. Incidentally, however, it transferred Naples from Murat to the Bourbons.

(ii) INTERNATIONAL POSITION OF FRANCE. From the international point of view, the "Hundred Days" directly weakened France in two ways.

(1) **Material Resources**—*i.e.*, territory and other spoils of conquest. Whereas the conquerors of 1814 had restored France to its boundaries of 1792, and had even added thereto parts of Savoy, etc., now in 1815 they took these away: Chambéry and the rest of French Savoy, Landau, Saarlouis, Philippeville, etc., were ceded by France, together with the art treasures which she had plundered from the cities of Europe. She was also saddled with an army of occupation, which not only trampled on French national sentiment, but also cost France more than £20,000,000.

(2) **Diplomatic Prestige.** The greatest change effected by the "Hundred Days," however, was the change in the diplomatic situation. At the Congress of Vienna, before the news of Napoleon's return had arrived, Talleyrand had been able to obtain a general acceptance of the view that the Allies had been fighting, not France, but Napoleon, and to win a respectable position for France in the councils of Europe. He took advantage of Prussia's desire to absorb Saxony, and of Russia's desire to enlarge Poland, to set the three Eastern Powers by the ears; and he not only made the friendship of France useful to each of these great Powers, but also established France as the champion of the rights of the smaller Powers. He had gone so far as to make a treaty between Great Britain, Austria, and France, January, 1815, to checkmate the designs of Prussia and Russia.

All this was lost by Napoleon's return. France was seen to be too unstable at home to be trusted by the Powers. Louis XVIII. was restored, at Waterloo, by foreigners; and the wits of Paris said he had been brought back by the Allies "in their baggage." For some years the international position and the internal condition of France played disastrously one on the other. Specially may this be seen when we read that Louis XVIII., or his minister, Richelieu, could not induce the Allies to withdraw the army of occupation till the country was at rest; while he could not satisfy the opponents of his minister till the forces of the Allies were withdrawn. It was not till the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1818, that France even began to recover from this unfortunate position into which Napoleon's reckless ambition had brought her in his last great gamble for power.

IV. **Remarks.** Can you think of any cases in British History where dependence on foreign support had any marked influence on a "restoration," actual or attempted? What precisely is meant by "the French frontier of 1790" and "the French frontier of 1792"? Has France a "natural frontier"? If it has, where would you place it, and why? What art-treasures was France compelled to disgorge in 1815? In what different parts of France were the various armies of occupation placed? Collect sayings or anecdotes of men like Alexander I., Blücher, Castlereagh, Metternich, and Wellington, illustrating their opinions on the proper treatment to be accorded to France before and after the "Hundred Days."

V. **References.** Ample materials for writing or amplifying this question are given in all the books on the period, large and small. The question is explicitly answered, from a French point of view, in the brilliant and suggestive essay by Baron Pierre de Coubertin, entitled "France since 1814."

I. Question 3. *What was the extent of Metternich's influence in the years 1814-48?*

II. **Jottings.** In Austria, it was complete from 1809 to 1848. In Germany, the ascendency of Austria, *i.e.*, of Metternich, was helped by the continuance of the Imperial idea ; and Austria also took the part of the smaller states against Prussia ; but in Weimar and other places in South Germany, the princes granted constitutions. In Russia, Metternich's influence was growing in these years. Alexander was not the same at Aix-la-Chapelle as he was in 1815. In Europe generally, the Quadruple Alliance was in accordance with Metternich's views.

III. **Answer.** It is generally supposed that Metternich ruled almost absolutely during the period 1814-1848, not only in Austria and throughout Germany, but also in the whole of Europe. In the contest between Liberalism and Reaction, a contest so long unfavourable to the former, Metternich seems to be the "evil genius" of Europe. With his fall in 1848 Europe could breathe again. Such is the popular impression. But, like many other such widespread views, it fails to maintain itself, when the history of day by day is studied. Even Metternich *rose* to power, had his time of culmination, and his gradual decline. Events in the first half of the nineteenth century were no more cataclysmic than at any other period of history. On the whole, Metternich's influence was growing, both locally and generally, during the period under review.

(i) AUSTRIA-HUNGARY. In the Austrian Empire, of course, Metternich was, from the beginning of the period, absolute master. Metternich, who had been Chancellor of Austria since 1809, had set his face against Stein's policy of appealing to national feeling in the Wars of Liberation against Napoleon : hence, in Austria-Hungary, the Wars of Liberation had inspired no hopes and caused no disappointments among the various "nationalities" of that heterogeneous mass. During these years they had but little, if any, practical desire for change ; and Austria may be said to have no internal history.

(ii) GERMANY. In Germany, Metternich's influence was great, but it had to be gained. Prussia had been Austria's rival for many years, at least since the accession of Frederick the Great in 1740 ; and she was unwilling to allow to the modern Austrian Empire the powers and prestige of the old Holy Roman Empire. But the Austrian statesman succeeded in gaining that inheritance, and in causing men to forget the events of 1804 and 1806. The ruler of Austria was still "Emperor" ; and it was convenient and possible for Austria to induce men, and Germans in particular, to forget that the title did not now mean [elective] "Roman Emperor," but only [hereditary] "Emperor of Austria." All that "the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation" meant of old to Germans was now used to help maintain Austria's power, not only in Germany but in Italy. Prussia, unable to wrest the leadership from Austria and Metternich, proposed to divide with Austria the control of Germany. Metternich told the minor princes of this proposal, and thus won their support against the encroaching policy of Prussia. Gradually German affairs became practically a department of the Austrian chancery, later even of the Austrian police. Yet, even in Germany, Metternich was never absolutely supreme.

(iii) RUSSIA. With Russia, it was a question of the personal opinions of Alexander ; and in 1815 he was notoriously "Liberal." The process whereby Metternich won the Tsar over to his own ideas was only beginning when the Congress of Aix met in 1818. In that year Alexander had opened the Polish Diet with a most optimistic speech ; but he had since been alarmed by plots against him, even within "Holy Russia" itself.

(iv) GENERAL. In Spain, Naples, and France, during the years 1814-1818, events were going in the direction that Metternich desired, though we may not quote them as evidence of his direct influence. In the formation of the Quadruple Alliance of 1818, however, we see a practical application by him, in his own sense, of what he might regard as useful in the ideas of the Holy Alliance. Everywhere his agents were endeavouring, mostly with success, to counteract the influences emanating from the court of Alexander, "which," wrote Metternich, "has rendered homage to what is called the spirit of the times, and which, by its words, has roused the hopes of innovators and sectarians of every description."

IV. **References.** Biographies of Metternich : (*a*) by C. A. Fyffe in *Encyclopædia Britannica ;* (*b*) by G. B. Malleson in "Statesmen Series" ; (*c*) short study by A. Hayward in *Sketches of Eminent Statesmen and Writers,* vol. I. His own Memoirs, 1773-1835, have been translated into English ; but these are less valuable than the notices of him in the official memoirs of such contemporaries as Canning, Castlereagh, and Palmerston. For the period covered by this question see the ordinary histories, large and small (using indexes) ; especially Seignobos, ch. xxv., "Europe under the Metternich System," 1815-1830. The principal documents of the period—Charta, Holy Alliance, German Act of Confederation, Carlsbad Decrees, Troppau Circular—are accessible in cheap form (1/-) in the "Translations and Reprints" (University of Pennsylvania)—vol. I., part iii., *The Restoration and the European Policy of Metternich.*

I. **Question 4.** *What was the Holy Alliance? Describe the system to which this name was afterwards applied.*

II. **Jottings.** Alexander's character. The Holy Alliance proposed in September, 1815: terms and intention. The assent given to it various. The treaties made at Aix, November, 1818. The split in the Alliance, 1820. Only the three Eastern Powers adhere, and a change is practically effected, not only in Alexander's attitude, but in the spirit of the Alliance—International peace *v.* internal conservatism; "nations" *v.* governments; large Powers *v.* small Powers; Intervention *v.* Non-Intervention.

III **Answer.** The "Holy Alliance" was suggested by the Tsar, Alexander I., and has to be interpreted by reference to his personal ideas.

(i) The Original Alliance: Alexander I.'s Ideal. Alexander's character was mixed. By birth a member of the "Orthodox" Greek Church, he had learned the principles of Rousseau from his Swiss tutor, Laharpe, and those of Russian militarism from his military governor, Soltikov. He had attempted reform in Russia and failed: he had made alliance with Napoleon and been deceived. In September 1815, having become "pious" and Liberal, he proposed to his fellow-sovereigns assembled at Vertus, in France, a document which astonished them all—a draft of the Treaty of Holy Alliance. They were "to declare their intention of establishing their mutual relations on the sublime truths of the religion of God our Saviour, and to base their policy on principles of justice, charity, and peace." The Emperor of Austria, whose minister, Metternich, described it as "verbiage," signed it unwillingly; the King of Prussia took it seriously; the Prince Regent of Great Britain, whose minister, Castlereagh, thought it "a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense," assented to it in characteristic fashion. Such was the original Holy Alliance and its reception in Europe. Of course, it had no practical effect on politics.

(ii) The Later Alliance: Metternich's Practical Version. By 1818, however, Alexander was beginning to change his political opinions, and to agree in his views about Liberalism with Metternich. At the "Congress" of Aix-la-Chapelle, therefore, besides the renewal of the Quadruple Alliance of 1815, against a possibly aggressive France, another treaty was made, to which France was invited to adhere. It was made on November 15, 1818, and declared the intention of the parties not to break the intimate union, strengthed by the ties of Christian brotherhood, contracted by the sovereigns, pronounced the object of this union to be the preservation of peace on the basis of respect for treaties, and arranged that no partial reunions should take place concerning the affairs of other states without their invitation, and, if desired, their presence.

The Holy Alliance, thus modified, entered into practical politics as a principle of action. But this Quintuple Alliance of 1818 was essentially different from the original Holy Alliance of 1815. That Holy Alliance itself was a personal association, in which all European sovereigns except the Pope and the Sultan were invited to join, and in which all those invited, except the King of Great Britain, did actually join; and it was of an entirely general and religious character. The Quintuple Alliance was a diplomatic instrument of the ordinary type in which the religious phrases were purely incidental, and to which only "the Five Great Powers" were parties.

In 1820, when Portugal, Spain, and Naples were in constitutional struggles, and it was proposed that the Allied Great Powers should intervene, at least in Spain, Great Britain and France refused to join in common action; and it was only the three Eastern, or as Metternich called them, the three "free" Powers, which agreed at Troppau to carry out "the Concert of Europe." The reason for the refusal of the two "limited" monarchies was that such intervention in purely domestic disputes was not required by the treaties on which the intervention was professedly based, and was in itself undesirable, and that the Alliance was tending to become an alliance of "Kings" against "Peoples."

Thus, to British observers in general, the original object of the Holy Alliance was obscured by its later developments, in which the vague and general religious aspirations of the original document were overlaid by practical and monarchical considerations. When it was "pure" it was ineffective: when it became effective, it had become what Liberal historians at least have regarded as "impure" and even "unholy."

IV. **References.** A full translation of the original *Holy Alliance* is given in J. H. Robinson, *The Restoration and the European Policy of Metternich* ("Translations and Reprints of the University of Pennsylvania," vol. I., Part iii): many extracts both from the original Alliance of 1815 and from the later documents that grew out of it are given in all histories of the period, large and small. The opinions of contemporaries about it—whether responsible statesmen or poets and other writers—are worth collecting, with due attention to the date when the opinions were expressed. In 1823, for instance, Moore published a volume entitled *Fables for the Holy Alliance;* and Byron makes many trenchant (not necessarily true) remarks on contemporary politics, especially in *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage.*

I. **Question 5.** *What were the various results of the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle?*

II. **Jottings.** Congress held at Aachen, September-November, 1818. (*a*) Successful results:—The evacuation of France; the renewal of the *Quadruple Alliance;* the *Quintuple Alliance;* the conversion of Alexander to Metternich's policy and the consequences thereof; the acquirement by Austria of influence over the King of Prussia, and the consequences thereof; the settlement of disputes between Sweden and Denmark, and about the Baden succession question, etc. (*b*) Unsuccessful attempts:—Russo-French proposal *re* Spanish America; Russo-Prussian proposal *re* Barbary; Great Britain's proposal *re* the Slave Trade.

III. **Answer.** The Congress (or rather *Conference*) held at Aix-la-Chapelle (*Aachen*) in the autumn of 1818 was the first and the only successful attempt to carry out the idea of a united Europe. The business of the Congress falls into two main divisions.

(i) Successful Proposals. On certain matters the Congress was unanimous.

(1) **France.** It was decided that France was now at length restored to such a measure of internal stability that it was possible and desirable to complete the evacuation of the country, and accordingly all foreign troops were withdrawn from beyond the Rhine. Yet it was also felt to be necessary to maintain the *Quadruple Alliance* (of Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia), which had been formed in 1815 to prepare for any further outburst of French "Jacobinism." This protective treaty was accordingly renewed before France was admitted to join the "Four Powers" in the *Quintuple Alliance.*

(2) **The Concert of Europe.** Alexander's ideas of a *Holy Alliance* were modified by Austria's desire to make a practical union for the maintenance of the *status quo,* and by Great Britain's distrust of Russia's pious professions, as well as by the inability of her ministers to commit themselves (in view of Parliamentary opinion) to *any* vague policy. Accordingly, the Treaty of 15 November, 1818, was restricted to a general promise by the five contracting Powers to act together in the ordinary ways of diplomacy, and to intervene in the affairs of minor States only at the direct invitation of such States, and at conferences at which such States should be represented. Later events were to show how little this agreement would work in practice, and how short a time it would last.

(3) **Germany.** At the Congress there were many private conferences, and Metternich was able in this way to win over Russia and Prussia to his views. He used certain recent events in Russia to influence Alexander; and accordingly Russian agents ceased to communicate with secret societies in Italy and elsewhere, while Stourdza's pamphlet, supposed to have been instigated by Alexander, proved the existence and danger of revolutionary movements in Germany. Metternich also demonstrated successfully to the King of Prussia how impossible of fulfilment was his idea of a national assembly for Prussia. Certain minor matter were also settled by the Congress of Aix: Sweden was forced to behave towards Denmark (who was aiding Norwegian "rebels") in accordance with the wishes of the Congress; Hesse and Baden were commanded to treat the "mediatized" princes with more consideration; and a quarrel between Bavaria and Baden concerning the succession to the duchy was settled in favour of the ruling duke.

(ii) Unsuccessful Proposals. The proposals made at the Congress which were not adopted are as significant as those that were.

(1) **Spanish America.** Russia and France proposed to help Spain to reconquer her American colonies; but they were prevented by the opposition of Great Britain, whose trade with these countries was growing in consequence of the disappearance of the commercial restrictions formerly imposed by the Mother Country.

(2) **Barbary Corsairs.** Russia and Prussia proposed to suppress the piracy of the Barbary Corsairs; but here again the way was barred by Great Britain, fearing a Russian fleet in the Mediterranean.

(3) **Slave Trade.** Great Britain's own proposal to suppress the Slave Trade was negatived by the other Powers, jealous of what Britain might do under that pretence with a ubiquitous fleet.

The unsuccessful proposals show how far the Powers really were from a working concert. They could be expected to agree only when no private interest conflicted with the general interests; and when in two or three years, another congress was attempted, Europe was found to be once more divided. The Powers had with difficulty agreed on *territorial delimitation* at Vienna: they naturally fell asunder on the more abstruse questions of *political intervention* which formed the chief *agenda* of the later congresses.

IV. **References.** The accounts of the Congress in the histories of the period, large and small, can readily be found with the help of the index. A good short annotated bibliography of the best books on the international relations of this period is given at the end of the chapter (ch. xxv.) on "Europe under the Metternich System" in Seignobos, *Contemporary Europe.*

I. **Question 6.** *Summarise the results, on German institutions, of the Conferences of Carlsbad and Vienna.*

II. **Jottings.** Constitutions of Bavaria and Baden, 1818. The murder of Kotzebue, March, 1819. Beginnings of Spanish revolt, July, 1819. Conference of Teplitz, August 1, between Austria and Prussia, where the business of Carlsbad, August, was arranged. In September, the Diet carried out the resolutions of Carlsbad. September, 1819, Constitution granted in Würtemberg, and Grégoire elected to the French Parliament. March-May, 1820, Conference at Vienna, and its resolutions adopted by the Diet in June. All reactionary.

III. **Answer.** (i) Antecedents. The Congress of Vienna in 1815 had given the German Confederation a Diet which was so constituted that it was helpless except to maintain the *status quo,* and thus effected the purpose of Metternich, who feared the slightest change. German Liberalism, therefore, was driven to be "Particularist," *i.e.,* to work for constitutions in single states, rather than for the unity of the German people. In Bavaria, Baden, and other South German states, parliamentary constitutions were granted, which led to much Radical talk, to the alarm of Austria. In 1819 Kotzebue, the dramatic poet, who was believed to have had a share in the conversion of Alexander of Russia to reactionary principles, was murdered by Sand, a university student; and this event was used by Metternich to alarm still further the reactionary Powers.

(ii) The Punctation of Teplitz, July, 1819. Metternich came from Italy, where he had been visiting Rome, and in an interview with the King of Prussia at Teplitz, in Bohemia, arranged the *agenda* for the Conference which was shortly to meet hard by, at Carlsbad. At Teplitz, the idea which the King of Prussia, under Hardenberg's influence, had long entertained of granting a constitution to Prussia, and of summoning a "national" parliament for the whole kingdom was finally set aside, and Austria and Prussia agreed to claim together to "watch over the affairs of the German Confederation," *i.e.,* to regulate all German matters without consultation with, or at least in defiance of, the other German States. They agreed to interpret Article 13 of the *Final Act of Vienna,* 1815 (which prescribed "Estates" for each German State), in a reactionary sense.

(iii) Conference of Carlsbad, August, 1819. Accordingly, a meeting of the eight larger German States (the five Kingdoms, and the Duchies of Baden, Mecklenburg, and Nassau) was held at Carlsbad in August, 1819. There it was agreed that no constitution "inconsistent with the monarchical principle" should be permitted in any State. All associations of German students, all gymnasia or higher public schools, were to be abolished; in universities, Government "curators" were to watch the behaviour of professors and students alike, lest there should come into existence "a whole generation of revolutionaries"; a censorship of the Press was determined on; and a Commission of enquiry into revolutionary agitations was to sit at Mainz and report. Decrees corresponding to these resolutions mere forced through the Diet, which sat in September; and these are known as the *Carlsbad Decrees.*

(iv) Conference at Vienna, May, 1820. Metternich, however, had roused the opposition of the smaller German States by his high-handed behaviour. Russia and Great Britain, too, were not willing to follow him to extremes; and when the King of Würtemberg granted again a Parliamentary Constitution in September, 1819, he was supported by his cousin, Alexander, to such an extent that, when the Conference of Vienna met in March, 1820, Metternich was obliged to moderate his desires. The news of revolts in Spain and Italy, however, which arrived during the sitting of the Conference, helped him; and in the end the Conference agreed that, under the *Act of Confederation,* the supreme power resided for each State in the person of the Sovereign, and that no constitution could be lawful which did not emanate from the Sovereign or was the result of armed force. If any government appealed for help, or was unable to keep order, intervention was allowable. All these resolutions were adopted by the German Diet in June, 1820, and henceforward no "liberty" existed in German States except in the South (where French influence had been strongest). The aristocratico-monarchical institutions both of Germany as a whole and of German States in particular, were crystallised till the great upheaval of 1848 and subsequent years, when the *Carlsbad Decrees* were formally repealed by both the old and the new assemblies at Frankfort.

IV. **References.** The Carlsbad Decrees are translated in J. H. Robinson, *The Restoration and the European Policy of Metternich* (Pennsylvania University, "Translations and Reprints," vol. I., part iii.); and extracts from all the documents concerned can be easily and profitably collected from the histories, large and small. There are good connected accounts of German affairs during the period in Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire,* ch. xxii.; C. M. Andrews, *Historical Development of Modern Europe* (vol. I., ch. vi.); and C. Seignobos, *Political History of Contemporary Europe* (ch. xii.). The last-named combines soundness, brevity, and clearness to quite an exceptional degree, and winds up with a good select bibliography (mainly of German books).

I. **Question 7.** *Describe briefly the objects and the methods of revolt in Latin Europe in 1820.*

II. **Jottings.** The Spanish Constitution of 1812: democratic; lacking King's initiative or consent. The violent reaction in Spain on the Bourbon Restoration in 1814. The revolt of the Colonies. The poverty of Spain. Military revolts in 1819-20. Their unsuccess, and consequent civil war. Portugal and Brazil. The British trade and influence. Military revolt successful. Moderate rule of Ferdinand in Naples. Evils thereof, specially favouritism in the Army. Consequent military revolt and adoption of the Spanish Constitution of 1812. Ferdinand's double policy.

III. **Answer.** In 1820 revolts broke out in both "Latin" peninsulas—*i.e.*, in the kingdoms of Spain, Portugal, and the Two Sicilies.

(i) Spain. During the war which the Spanish nation, with British help, waged against Napoleon from 1808 to 1814, the Cortes assembled at Cadiz framed a Constitution in 1812 of so democratic a character that it could never become workable. The return of Ferdinand, the "Idolized," to Spain in 1814, was followed by a violent reaction. The Inquisition was re-established; the ultra-ecclesiastical party had it all their own way in Church matters; and the King with his *Camarilla* was supreme in matters of State.

The majority of the Spanish nation were well content with this, but they were discontented with the general condition of the country. The possession of Central and South America (except Brazil) had ruined the Spanish people, for the nation had learned to depend on the revenues thence accruing, and had failed to keep the commerce with their colonies, a commerce which had fallen into the hands of the Dutch and afterwards the British. When the Colonies fell away from Spanish control during the Napoleonic wars, Spain was too exhausted to enforce their return to subjection. Yet she would not acknowledge their independence, and continually made futile efforts to subdue them. The poverty of the people and the burden of taxation made the nation sullenly discontent; and the miserable condition of the soldiery, coupled with the prospect of having to cross the Atlantic in the unseaworthy vessels sold to Spain by Russia, gave the occasion for military revolts. Their first attempt (in 1819) was betrayed by their leader, O'Donnell, Count of Abispal; but in the following year various parts of the Army—acting without, or rather against, their officers—succeeded so far as to compel the King to accept the Constitution of 1812. An assembly accordingly met at Madrid; but it roused such opposition by ignoring provincial feeling, by its financial measures, and by anti-ecclesiastical policy, that a reaction set in, and Spain was in civil war for the next two years.

(ii) Portugal. In Portugal the general political conditions were much the same as in Spain, but the dominant problem was different. The insecurity of the European kingdom had driven the Court to Brazil; and the Portuguese found that the mutual relations of the two crown lands was becoming reversed. *They* were now the colony to a "mother country"—Brazil. Trade relations were also unfavourable to the Portuguese, for the British had secured most of the trade with South America, and Marshal Beresford was Regent in Portugal for the absent King. The Portuguese, therefore, were discontented, and thought they could secure political and commercial salvation by imitating their neighbours in Spain, and demanding a Constitution like that of Spain. A military revolt, beginning at Oporto in 1820, easily secured their desires. Beresford was not allowed to land on his return from a visit to Brazil, and the King was allowed to enter the country only on assenting to the Constitution thus promulgated (1822).

(iii) The Two Sicilies. In Naples again, there was a third set of circumstances, differing from the other two. Ferdinand's return from his island kingdom of Sicily (where he had been protected from Napoleon and Murat by the British fleet and by the Straits of Messina) was marked by a very moderate reaction. For the most part, Ferdinand maintained the system established by Murat. Yet the form of government was no security against injustice and favouritism. The latter was felt mostly among the army officers. Naples and Sicily had been separated for several years, and the King preferred to the higher posts those exclusively who had served with him in Sicily. The result was great resentment among those who had remained in Naples, and served under the various governments appointed by the French. Accordingly, there was a military revolt, and Pepe, who took the lead, proclaimed the Spanish Constitution of 1812, as the panacea for the evils of the country. Ferdinand swore in the most emphatic terms to keep the Constitution; and for a time, all seemed to have ended well in Naples.

IV. **References.** The various workings of military discontent in conjunction with Liberalism, imbibed from both British and French sources, deserve comparative study. For this purpose the various disconnected accounts given in the ordinary histories, large and small, may profitably be supplemented by Seignobos, *Contemporary Europe*, ch. x., xi. (with select bibliographies).

I. **Question 8.** *What were the principles of the various Powers as developed at Troppau and Laibach?*

II. **Jottings.** A general reaction in Europe after the Carlsbad Conference, 1819. The revolts in Latin Europe. Russia's desire for intervention in Spain. Austria converted to intervention by the revolt in Naples: "domestic concern." She is forced by Russia and France to meet a Congress. Aloofness of Great Britain. The Troppau Protocol, 1820. Its results in Naples, leading to the decision of Laibach, 1821. The Restoration in Naples and unsuccessful attempt in Piedmont. Italy to be germanised. Troppau in Silesia, Laibach in Carniola (both Austrian).

III. **Answer.** In 1820, thanks to the working of the compromise, effected at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, between the ideas of Metternich and those of the Holy Alliance, reaction was advancing all over Europe during the next few years.

(i) Agenda of the Congresses: Naples. The events which led to the Congresses of Troppau and Laibach were the military revolts in Spain, Portugal, and, especially in Naples. Early in 1820, while Naples was still quiescent, Russia had proposed, in the spirit of the *Holy Alliance*, to intervene in Spain. But Austria, fearful of the extension of Russian influence, had prevented this from being carried out, and had insisted on the principle of non-intervention. But when Naples was disturbed, Austria feared for her rule in Italy, and, regarding Italian affairs as part of her "domestic concerns," wished to intervene alone. Great Britain was of the same mind, partly because Britain and Austria were old allies, partly because British interests were not involved, and partly because Castlereagh was opposed to any violent changes. But Russia and France insisted that the question was one which interested all Europe, and was therefore matter for a Congress. Russia was in this merely consistent with her old idea of a concert of Europe; and France was jealous of any further increase of Austria's power in Italy.

(ii) Action of the Congresses: Intervention by the Eastern Powers. Accordingly the Congress met at Troppau in the autumn of 1820. Britain would have nothing to do with it. Her ambassador was instructed only to watch events. France was more inclined to take part. Metternich was willing, as at the Germanic Conference of Vienna a few months before, to recognise constitutions if granted willingly by monarchs; but as the Troppau Protocol [of 19 November] put it:—

> States which have undergone a change of government due to revolution, the results of which threaten other states, *ipso facto* cease to be members of the European Alliance, and remain excluded from it until their situation gives guarantees for legal order and stability. . . If, owing to such alterations, immediate danger threatens other states, the Powers bind themselves, by peaceful means, or, if need be, by arms, to bring back the guilty state into the bosom of the Great Alliance.

Thus the principle of the *Holy Alliance* was for the first time applied to a concrete case—that of Naples. But, in thus coming into practical working, it showed, if we may be allowed the apparent absurdity, its impracticality; for it was only the three Eastern Powers, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, that adhered to the Protocol. Great Britain lodged a formal protest; France stood aloof. The revolutionists of Naples, however, played into the hands of their enemies. Probably, if their conduct had been moderate, Russia might have forced Austria to recognise a constitution granted by Ferdinand; but the mob of Naples, by intimidating the Parliament to compel Ferdinand to swear again to the Constitution, and to forbid him leaving the country, made it possible for him to pose as an oppressed monarch at the Congress now adjourned to Laibach (1821). Metternich, therefore, triumphed; Austrian troops marched into Naples, and, though badly financed, were able by the mistakes of their opponents to restore Ferdinand as an absolute monarch under the guardianship of Austria.

While Austrian troops were marching into South Italy, the Liberals of Savoy-Piedmont attempted a revolution to strike against Austria in the North. But Victor Emmanuel resigned the kingship of Sardinia; his brother, Charles Albert, joined the rebels only to abandon them; and the new king, Charles Felix, was able with Austrian help to crush the incipient rebellion at Novara. Henceforth Italy was under Austria, and Metternich began the plan of attempting the "germanisation" of Italy to crush the rising feeling of nationality.

It has been well said that "Troppau" and "Laibach" applied the principles of the *Carlsbad Decrees* to all Europe. In all cases, Metternich represented these assemblies as unanimous in action against "the vast conspiracy to overthrow existing institutions." As a matter of fact, the Reactionaries were almost as much divided as the Revolutionists.

IV. **References.** The Troppau Circular is translated in J. H. Robinson, *The Restoration and the European Policy of Metternich* (Pennsylvania University, "Translations and Reprints," vol. I., part iii.). The accounts in the general histories may profitably be supplemented by those in histories of Italy, especially that by J. Bolton King, *History of Italian Unity*.

I. **Question 9.** *Why did the revolt in Portugal succeed, while those of Spain and Naples failed? How far was the result owing to differences among the Powers?*

II. **Jottings.** Relations between Austria and Naples, between France and Spain. Russia's continual wish to intervene makes her insist on Congressional methods. Necessity for both Austria and France to respect the opinion of the other Powers in each case. Policy of Great Britain in each case, indifferent in the case of Naples, interested in Spain, and still more in Portugal. Effect of geographical position on the diplomatic situation. Importance of remembering that the Liberals were only one party in each State, not always with the sympathy of the majority of the population.

III. **Answer.** The struggle for constitutional government in the three Latin kingdoms illustrates the contest between the idea of the Concert of Europe, of which Russia was the consistent champion, and the desire of Austria and France to retain in their own hands the settlement of the internal affairs of those countries which were respectively within their own "spheres of influence" (to adopt a later political phrase).

(i) NAPLES. At Troppau and Laibach, Russia defeated the particularism of Austria, who was therefore compelled to intervene in Naples, not for her own hand, but as the mandatory of Europe, or rather of the three Eastern Powers who still clung to the concert.

(ii) SPAIN. In 1822, the civil war in Spain had lasted long enough to draw the attention of Europe. Russia had already proposed, more than once, to lend her troops for the purpose of restoring order and "legitimate" government in that country, but had been checkmated by the natural jealousy of Austria and France. Now France, at the height of her own "reaction," was desirous of winning military glory for the Bourbon lilies, of restoring legitimacy in Spain, and securing the influence in that country which she regarded as due to the "ties of family affection." But she could not venture on the invasion, regard being had to the possible opposition of Great Britain, without asking for the "moral," and even possibly the "material," support of the Eastern Powers. This revelation of her weakness gave to those Powers the opportunity of enforcing their will on France; and, as Austria in Naples, so France in Spain was compelled to act, not purely for her own interest, but as representing the (maimed) "Concert of Europe." Austria and France, however, having in each case paid the necessary price, made short work of the badly-managed constitutional governments to which they were opposed.

Great Britain was indifferent to Neapolitan affairs. Her old alliance with Austria led her to be friendly towards that Power, and to be willing to leave Italian affairs entirely in her hands. She had protested at Troppau and Laibach against the action of concerted Europe in that country. At Verona, she vainly protested against European intervention in Spain. But, when Russia proposed that, after effecting a restoration in Spain through French arms, Europe should subdue the South American revolts, Great Britain could with her fleet put an absolute veto upon the proposal. At the same time, she had the support of the United States, whose President, James Monroe, early in 1823, sent the famous "message" to Congress, which may be summarised as "America for the Americans," and which has since become so famous as the basis of the "Monroe Doctrine."

(iii) PORTUGAL. In Portugal, Great Britain had all-important interests. Ever since the reign of Queen Anne, Portugal had been the humble ally of the only Sea Power that could protect her against the Bourbon Powers. By encouraging the independence of Brazil, and by ousting Portuguese trade from that country, Great Britain had made herself obnoxious to many Portuguese merchants: hence a French party had grown up in Portugal, represented by Dom Miguel, second son of King John VI. When in 1826 John VI. died, his elder son, Peter, who had been "Emperor" of Brazil, renounced his Portuguese throne in favour of his daughter, Maria, but first granted to Portugal a "constitution." To this arrangement Miguel was opposed; and therefore it chanced that the British party was in favour of the "Constitution," while Miguel and the French party were absolutists. But while British statesmen cared nothing for what form of government should prevail in Portugal, they were determined to support Maria, and at first with a fleet, and afterwards, when occasion required, with an army, supported their allies. Thus Portugal preserved her constitutional government, while Spain and Naples lost theirs, mainly because the Great Powers chiefly interested were so disposed.

Two remarks must be added. Owing to geographical position, Portugal was more easily defended by Britain, less easily attacked by the Eastern Powers than either Spain or Naples. In all three countries, as we have seen, the Liberals were but a party, in Spain certainly in a minority, and probably so in Naples and Portugal.

IV. **References.** For the general question see the general histories, large and small, and biographies, etc., of Canning, Castlereagh, and Metternich: the European aspects of the Latin Revolts are briefly treated in Seignobos, *Contemporary Europe*, ch. xxv. For the Monroe Doctrine see the collection of sources in "Old South Leaflets," No. 56, and essay by W. F. Reddaway.

I. Question 10. *What was the difference between the policies of Castlereagh and Canning? How far was it merely apparent, being due to circumstances more than intention?*

II. **Jottings.** Lord Liverpool, Prime Minister, 1812-1827. Castlereagh (Londonderry), Foreign Secretary, 1812-1822. Canning in the Ministry (President of the Board of Control), 1816-1820; Foreign Secretary, 1822-1827; Prime Minister, April till August, 1827. Castlereagh did not approve of the original *Holy Alliance,* 1815 (which he thought "Cromwellian" and "nonsense"), and did not agree, owing partly to Canning's influence, to the proposed *Quintuple Alliance* of 1818. He opposed the *Carlsbad Decrees,* 1819, and refused to agree (1819) to the re-establishment of the Committee of Ambassadors to watch French internal affairs.

On Castlereagh's suicide in September, 1822, Canning followed his predecessor in protesting against intervention in Spain, 1820-1822, and against the *Protocol of Troppau.* Canning (with Monroe) also protected South America against intervention from Europe. He maintained the British party in Portugal against the French, but would not interfere with constitutional questions. In Greek affairs, 1822-1827, he was opposed to Russia, and intervened only to prevent Russia conducting by herself a probably successful war against Turkey.

III. Answer. It has been usual to contrast Castlereagh and Canning in respect of both their international and their internal policy, but there are really more points in common between them than points of difference. Castlereagh, who had come under the personal influence of Metternich, seems to have had a greater horror of sudden revolution than Canning, and certainly disapproved of the constitutional struggles of "Liberals," whether peaceful or violent, at home or abroad. Canning was as Tory as Castlereagh in reference to the British constitution; but with respect to the internal affairs of foreign nations, each case that fell for his decision (South America, Portugal, and Greece) was complicated by circumstances that interested Great Britain in a peculiar degree. She had fought too long in the Peninsula against the French to regard with indifference a Bourbon invasion of Spain, and specially was she interested in the Spanish colonies across the Atlantic, with whom she now had a lucrative trade.

Castlereagh lived while the only unrest in Europe was in Spain, Portugal, and Naples, and to a certain extent in Germany. With these purely internal questions, Great Britain was not specially concerned; and while Castlereagh sympathised with Metternich in his dislike of these sources of trouble, he disliked equally that "Concert of Europe" which Metternich was trying to create and maintain as a means of suppression by way of international intervention in the domestic affairs of every State. Hence Castlereagh, while he helped Bernadotte to suppress Norwegian opposition, disapproved both of Alexander's original *Holy Alliance* (which he called "a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense"), and of its developments—specially the *Carlsbad Decrees*, 1819; and he also protested against the *Troppau Protocol* of November, 1820, and the later proposals for intervention in Spain, 1820-1822.

Canning protected the Spanish American colonies in their revolt from European intervention, but only because British trade with them would have been destroyed by their subjection to Spain; and in this action he was supported, for similar reasons, by President Monroe, of the United States of North America. Of course, he maintained the British interests in Portugal against the French; and this he would probably have done even if France had been in favour of a "constitution," because in that country Great Britain had special commercial privileges.

In the Greek question, Canning kept his "classical" affinities in the background, and saw in the horrors of the Greco-Turkish war no reason for intervention. But Russia was to be feared as likely to use her championship of the Greeks as a pretext for encroachments in the Mediterranean: hence Canning was much put to it to guide affairs, through a tortuous diplomacy, in a way favourable to the interests of Great Britain. Though his phrases have become famous, they must be regarded merely as clever phrases. "A new world *was,*" if we will have it so, "brought into existence to redress the balance of the old," and a "war of opinion" was threatened by Canning in the Portuguese affair. But Canning was too much of a statesman to work for "ideals." He was as matter of fact in his diplomacy as Castlereagh. They both followed a purely British policy, and differed only in their attitude towards revolt—a difference which, as suggested in the question, was due more to circumstances than to difference of intention.

IV. **References.** Fyffe, *Modern Europe,* ch. xiv., explicitly answers the question at some length; and it is more or less directly treated in all histories of the period, whether British or foreign. The actual speeches and letters of the two statesmen are to be found in Sir A. Alison, *Life of Castlereagh,* and A. G. Stapleton, *Canning and his Times.* For a short account see Sir G. C. Lewis, *Administrations of Great Britain,* 1783-1830.

I. **Question II.** *With what aspirations and by what methods did the Greeks struggle for independence? What part did Ali Pasha of Janina and Mehemet Ali respectively play in the struggle?*

II. **Jottings.** The Greeks, their past history—political, social, ethnological, Hellenes, Romans, Orthodox Christians, Classical revival, Commerce. Their relations with the Turkish authorities. The Hetairia Philike. The Hypsilanti episode in Roumania. Ali of Janina, his career and fall. Morean revolt 1821, its methods and barbarities. Turkish reprisals. Massacre of Christians, April 1822. Sultan's appeal to Mehemet Ali. Egyptian conquest of Crete, 1824, and of the Morea, 1825. Missolonghi captured by Turks, June 1827. Capodistrias, President of Greece, April 1827. Battle of Navarino, October 1827. Great Britain and France cause Mehemet Ali to withdraw from the Morea, August 1828, and Capodistrias conquers northwards.

III. **Answer.** (i) Greek Aspirations. How far the inhabitants of the modern kingdom of Greece can lay claim to affinity with the compatriots of Leonidas and Demosthenes is a question not easily settled. That they are not of pure descent is certain, their blood being mingled with that of other peoples who have at various times inhabited the Balkan Peninsula—*e.g.*, Serbs, Albanians, etc. Till the eighteenth century they called themselves *Romaioi* (Romans) because they had been part of the Greek Roman Empire which perished in 1453. But in the eighteenth century the Renascence had reached Greece, and under the influence of Korais and other writers, the "classical" language had been revived, and the people learned to call themselves "Hellenes."

This Classicism, however, was not so deep a feeling (though it appealed strongly to Western sympathies) as their Orthodoxy. They were never allowed to forget they were Christians under a Muhammadan yoke, and they naturally looked to Russia, the great and powerful state of their own faith, for sympathy and support. Since the formation of Odessa, too, they had availed themselves of the Russian flag to carry on a lucrative commerce. Their social and legal position under Turkish rule was by no means despicable. Religion supplied the Greeks with aspirations; the "classical" revival was quite secondary; but both were equally important in winning the sympathies of Western Europeans.

(ii) Greek Methods in Roumania and Morea, 1821-1825. The Greek national uprising—long prepared by the Greek Brotherhood (Hetairia Philike) established at Odessa—broke out at last in 1821, when the Turkish authorities were preoccupied with a formidable rebellion in the western highlands of Albania. It was not until Janina, the hill-fortress of Ali Pasha, was captured in February 1822, that the Turkish military forces were free to turn their attention to the Greek revolts. The first of these, begun by the Greek Hypsilanti in Roumania in March 1821, lasted less than three months. Before the Roumanian insurrection was crushed, a larger movement began in the Morea. Under various leaders, without any unity or uniformity, the Greeks rose and, for the most part, massacred the Turkish population in their midst. In a few months the Morea was cleared of Turks. The Porte was vindictive. Christians were massacred in Constantinople, and Gregorios, Patriarch of Constantinople was hanged. More terrible still was the massacre of Chios in 1822. The Turkish fleet captured the island, and the whole population, a most peaceful and cultured one, was massacred or deported into slavery.

(iii) Outside Interference. So long as the Greeks held command of the sea, however, the suppression of their revolt was beyond the unaided resources of the Sultan. He therefore called on his vassal Mehemet Ali, Viceroy of Egypt; and, in return for many promised benefits, Mehemet sent his son Ibrahim to the help of his suzerain. In 1824 he conquered Crete, and in 1825 the Morea; and only a few fortified posts, in especial Missolonghi, were able to hold out against the Egyptian forces. Much of this Turkish success was due probably to disagreement among the Greek leaders, who in 1824, the year of their greatest success, waged civil war among themselves. They were but barbarians as yet. In April 1827 Capodistrias came to Greece as the elected President of the new "nation," and began his attempt to weld them into a homogeneous and orderly state. In April 1826 Missolonghi fell to the Turks; and henceforward the struggles of the Greeks themselves are but a part of the forces making for their independence. Their condition had become an international problem. The battle of Navarino, October 1827, destroyed the Egyptian fleet; and in the following year Great Britain and France compelled Mehemet Ali to withdraw his land forces from the Morea. Capodistrias took advantage of the Russo-Turkish war to extend the frontier of his country northwards; but the final result was settled not on the battlefields of Greece, but by the diplomacy of Europe.

IV. **References.** The general histories may well be supplemented by readings in Byron's poems and letters, and by such special books as W. A. Phillips, *War of Greek Independence, 1821-1833*; Mrs. Edmonds, *Koloktrones, Klepht and Warrior* ("Adventure Series"); and *Life of Sir Richard Church.*

I. **Question 12.** *Describe the international complications which led to the Battle of Navarino. What was the result of the battle?*

II. **Jottings.** Greek revolt in 1821. Russian attitude (territorial and ecclesiastical) towards Turkey. That of the other Powers generally friendly to Turkey. Subjects of dispute between Russia and Turkey. Anxiety of Europe to keep the peace between them. British recognition of Greek belligerency, March, 1823. All but complete suppression of Greek revolt, 1825. Anglo-Russian *Petersburg Protocol,* April, 1826. Russo-Turkish *Treaty of Akkermann,* October, 1826. *Treaty of London,* July, 1827. Hesitation to carry it out. Battle of Navarino, October, 1827. Russo-Turkish war, April, 1828. Brito-French expedition restores Morea to Greeks, 1828. *Treaty of Adrianople,* September, 1829. The Powers driven to recognise Greek independence.

III. **Answer.** (i) International Complications. The Eastern Question had not been taken in hand at the Congress of Vienna : hence the Greek revolt of 1821 raised quite different problems from those raised by the other contemporary revolts in Southern Europe.

(1) Russia. For various reasons, the Western Powers were interested in maintaining the integrity of Turkey, at least as against Russia ; and Russia, on the other hand, resented such interference, both because she considered herself the natural protector of Orthodox Christians and because she regarded Turkish affairs as falling within her "domestic concerns." While Alexander lived, this resentment was modified by his belief in the Concert of Europe; and till his death in December, 1825, Russian action was hesitating. Affairs were further complicated by the fact that Russia had several outstanding disputes with Turkey, which were settled by the *Treaty of Akkermann,* October, 1826.

(2) Russia and Great Britain. Meanwhile Great Britain had been driven, owing to the insecurity of trade, to recognise the belligerency of the Greek rebels in March, 1823 ; and the Sultan, with the help of his vassal, Mehemet Ali, had all but succeeded in suppressing the Greek revolt. In April, 1826, Great Britain and Russia, in spite of their mutual jealousy, agreed, by the Protocol of Petersburg, to erect Greece into a tributary State, from which, however, all Turks were to be expelled, and in which they were to own no property. If Turkey refused this offer, Great Britain and Russia were to establish a reconciliation, either separately or in common, on the basis of the Protocol.

(3) Russia, Great Britain, and France. In June, 1827, Athens was at last captured by the Turks, after a "heroic" defence ; and public opinion in Europe was beginning to think that the Greeks had suffered enough to deserve some measure of independence. Accordingly, in July, the Protocol of Petersburg was changed into the *Treaty of London,* between Russia, Great Britain, and France, the last Power having now come forward on behalf of Greece. Turkey was to be required to grant "autonomy" to Greece as in the terms of the Protocol. Should she refuse, the Powers were to establish commercial relations with the Greeks, and propose an armistice to both parties, which, if rejected, could be enforced by "peaceable" means, *e.g.,* a "pacific" blockade of Ibrahim's fleet. In August, Canning died, and Great Britain refused to fulfil the terms of the *Treaty of London,* and France followed her inaction. But in October, 1827, Admiral Codrington, acting in a manner which Wellington considered to be in perfect accordance with his instructions, destroyed the Egyptian fleet in the Bay of Navarino.

(ii) Results of Navarino. The immediate result was a declaration of war by Turkey against Russia ; Great Britain and France, anxious that Russia should not win all the advantages, and not trusting her previous declaration that she would seek no territorial advantages in Europe, took military possession of the Morea ; and Capodistrias, who had been President of Greece since April, 1827, took advantage of the situation to extend the limits of his country northwards. In September, 1829, Russia suddenly and unexpectedly ended the war triumphantly with the *Treaty of Adrianople.* Russia gained some small territory to the east of the Black Sea ; the Danubian Principalities were to have a purely Christian population and to be more under Russian protection than before ; the passage of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles was to be free for commerce ; and Greece was to be "autonomous," according to the *Protocol of Petersburg.*

The whole series of events, especially the growth of Russian influence on the Danube, had been unwelcome to Austria ; and accordingly Austria now agreed with Great Britain, that, in view of the *Treaty of Adrianople,* Greece must be completely independent. Turkey, over which Russia was getting complete influence, would thus be diminished in size. The negotiations were tedious, but the result was that in January, 1833, Otho of Bavaria became King of Greece, independent, and with a fair amount of territory.

IV. **References.** The best full account in English is W. A. Phillips, *The War of Greek Independence,* 1821-1833. The international aspects, which alone fall within the scope of this question, are briefly handled in Seignobos, ch. xxv. and Andrews, ch. iii (pp. 125-128).

I. **Question 13.** *What difference, if any, did the accession of Charles X. make in the internal affairs of France?*

II. **Jottings.** Parallelism (present to the minds of contemporary French politicians) between English history of 1660-1688 with French history 1814-1830. Possible parallel between (*a*) Louis XVIII. and Charles X., and (*b*) Charles II. and James II. Permanency of irreconcilable political parties in France. Gradual growth of the Reaction in France, as indicated by the ministries of Louis XVIII Incidents which helped this growth. The accession of Charles X., 1824: Intensification of the reactionary tendency. Villèle, Martignac (Liberal), Polignac; Ordinances of 1830.

III. **Answer.** (i) An English Parallel. It was a commonplace of contemporary political talk in France in the twenty years after the fall of Napoleon to compare the "restored" Bourbons to the "restored" Stuarts of the seventeenth century. In 1814, Monk, Earl of Albemarle, had been the favourite character among French politicians: in 1830 Frenchmen spoke much of William of Orange and the "Glorious Revolution." And there is, of course, at least a superficial resemblance in the two series of events. Much may also be said in favour of drawing a parallel between Charles II. and Louis XVIII., between James II. and Charles X. The two former were cautious statesmen, never venturing beyond what they thought would be borne out by public opinion. The two latter were "doctrinaires," each following a course which, at least in its later stages, was diametrically opposed to the public opinion of the nation, and losing their thrones as a consequence of their ignorance or recklessness. But the parallel must not be pushed too far. There was more contrast between the course of public events under James II. and that under Charles II. than between the public events respectively in the reigns of the Bourbon brothers. The reaction had gone far in France before the death of Louis. Charles X. continued on a larger scale his predecessor's later policy of furthering the wishes of the Clergy and the Nobility.

(ii) French Parties. During the greater part of the nineteenth century, France was more unfortunate than Great Britain in the history of her political parties. Proscription of political opponents died out in Great Britain under the rule of Walpole. Legitimism died, to all practical intents and purposes, at Culloden in 1746. And since that date, British party politicians, though differing widely on political matters, have, on the whole, treated one another as gentlemen and as patriots, whose differences arise only from different views as to the means of securing the welfare of the common country. In contrast to this state of things, French political parties, at least for a long time, never ceased to regard one another almost as traitors. Legitimists, Orleanists, Republicans, Napoleonists sought to proscribe one another; and the consequence was a bitterness of party strife which led not only to violent revolutions, or to the fear of such, but to endless animosity and uncertainty in ordinary political warfare.

(iii) Growth of Reaction in France, 1820-1830. During the reign of Louis XVIII. we can trace the growth in power of a violent reactionary party. The "White Terror" of 1815 and the "Chambre Introuvable" drove Fouché and Talleyrand from office, and the Duc de Richelieu ruled till 1818. In the year 1818-1820, Louis XVIII. struggled to rule as a moderate Liberal, with Dessolles and Decazes as ministers; but the election of Grégoire to the Chamber and the murder of the Duc de Berri gave to the party of Reaction in France much the same kind of opportunities as the Wartburg Festival and the murder of Kotzebue gave to Metternich in Germany. The French Reactionaries could and did represent themselves as the only men who could maintain the position of France against the jealous Powers; and in 1820 Richelieu returned to office only to retire the next year in favour of Villèle, the leader of the Reactionaries, who had practically directed matters for a twelvemonth. Thus, three years before the death of Louis XVIII., the Conservative forces had triumphed in France; and the King acted, through his ministers, both at home and abroad, in the direction that Metternich and his fellow-thinkers desired.

Yet, naturally, the accession of him who "had learned nothing and forgotten nothing" during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic period, gave further opportunities for reactionary measures. The emigrant nobles, who had left France in 1789-1792, at last obtained the compensation for their losses which they had long claimed; the Clergy gained more influence and power; unwelcome officials were dismissed; schools were closed; and the "National Guard" was dismissed. Except in the brief ministry of Martignac, Charles went further and further in this course, ignoring the views of the great middle class which the revolution had created, till he fell in 1830.

IV. **References.** The standard work in English is J. E. C. Bodley, *France since the Revolution*, which is partly historical, partly analytical. It is also desirable to look at these events through French spectacles; and for this purpose the accounts by Englishmen should be supplemented by such books as Coubertin, *France since 1814*, and Seignobos, *Contemporary Europe*, ch. v. (both translated into English).

I. Question 14.

What were the forces that overthrew Charles X.? What forces set up Louis Philippe?

II. **Jottings.** The Reaction under Louis XVIII. and Charles X. The growing unpopularity of the latter with the middle class and with the population of Paris. Attempt to restore "glory" in Algiers. The Ordinances of July, 1830. The Constitutional opposition. Republicanism in Paris. Lafayette, Laffitte, and Louis Philippe. The unstable character for a time of the "July" monarchy.

III. Answer.

As the question suggests, the overthrow of Charles X. did not necessarily involve the rise of Louis Philippe.

(i) Destructive Forces. Since 1815, France had tended, with some interruptions, towards the Reaction. In 1821, the Conservative party had placed Villèle in power as minister, and in 1824 the course of nature had given them a King after their own hearts in Charles X. The Nobility recovered many of their old privileges; the Clergy were all but restored to the position which they had held before 1789; various electoral laws had gradually narrowed the franchise; and the House of Peers had been "swamped" to outnumber the Liberal members. All this was extremely displeasing to the middle class of France (the *bourgeoisie*), which had come into existence as a result of the social changes of the Revolution; and the whole reign of Charles X. consists of a conflict between the King and the Lower Chamber, in which, despite the narrow franchise, the middle class found its exponents. In 1825, the National Guard, the citizen army of France, demanded the dismissal of Villèle, and was accordingly disbanded. In 1827 the censorship of the press was re-established, but Villèle was compelled to retire in face of the opposition in a newly-elected chamber. For some months the King ruled with Martignac, a moderate Liberal; but the continuance of opposition persuaded him that "nothing would satisfy these people." In 1829 he resolved once again to defy the opinion of his people: he dismissed Martignac and made the Prince de Polignac his minister. In July, 1830, Charles issued the four "Ordinances": the liberty of the press was suspended, the newly-elected Chamber was dissolved, a new Chamber was to be elected on a still further narrowed franchise. All this ended, as it may always be expected to end, in violent revolution. While the parliamentary and the newspaper men were still considering, Cavaignac and Lafayette had roused the Parisians to rise in favour of a republic. Charles X.'s reign was practically over; but it was still far from certain who should reign in his stead.

(ii) Constructive Forces. French revolutions are never simple affairs. The great Revolution of 1789-1795 consisted of five or six distinct movements: the revolution of 1830, though not so complicated, was not a single movement. The Parliamentarians and their allies in the Press were in no mood to follow the republicanism of Paris. Like the English and the Scots in 1688, they wished to make as little change as needful, whether dynastic or constitutional; and Laffitte, the banker, and his friends, especially Thiers, now brought forward Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans, as a candidate for the vacant French crown. He could be made to seem Republican, for his father was the "Philippe Egalité" of revolutionary times; he could claim to maintain French "glory," for he had fought under the tricolor flag; and he was sufficiently nearly related to the royal family to satisfy those monarchists who could not endure the "despotism" of Charles X. He therefore found favour with the middle class, and the republican party were outwitted by what we must call a bit of burlesque played by that old playactor Lafayette. In a somewhat theatrical scene, at the Hôtel de Ville, the veteran politician threw over his republican friends, and accepted the new monarchy of the *bourgeoisie*. For some months, Louis Philippe, King of the French, ruled, as he said, by the grace of Lafayette. Only when the monarchy had saved the ministers of Charles X. from mob fury, and had convinced the Powers that the new French Revolution did not intend to imitate its predecessor and make war on Europe, could Louis Philippe be considered as safely seated on his throne.

It was thus a union of all parties against ultra-reaction which overthrew Charles X., though it was the republican party which was most active. It was the middle class party, led by parliamentary deputies and "Whig" journalists, who, helped by Lafayette's flightiness, established Louis Philippe first as Regent and then as "King of the French."

IV. **References.** The contemporary utterances of the principal actors—Charles X., Louis Philippe, Thiers, and Cavaignac—and the no less conflicting judgments of well-informed historians, should be collected and compared from the manuals and other books accessible to the student. As an illustration of the influence of the British Protestant Revolutions of 1688 on the Revolution of July, it may be mentioned that Armand Carrel, the editor of the Orleanist newspaper, the *National*, wrote a *History of the Counter-Revolution in England* ("Bohn's Library," 3/6). The headline of this page is taken from Coubertin, *France since 1814*, ch. iii.

I. **Question 15.** *What were the causes, and what the consequences, of the Belgian Revolt of 1830?*

II. **Jottings.** Netherlands history. Differences (linguistic, religious, historical) between North and South. The Kingdom of the Netherlands 1815. Causes of Belgian discontent, linguistic, commercial, religious, resulting in nationalism. The Revolution. Questions of (*a*) existence, (*b*) extent, (*c*) dynasty.

III. **Answer.** (i) Causes of the Revolt: (1) Ultimate. The Netherlands had in the fifteenth century passed by marriage to the Austrian Hapsburgs, and had then descended to the Spanish branch of that family. Against Philip II. of Spain they had revolted, and the seven northern provinces had made good their independence, under the House of Orange, which had risen finally through a stadholderate to the position of Kingship. They were mainly Protestant, and are commonly called "Holland." The ten southern provinces (mainly Roman Catholic and collectively known as "Belgium") were reconquered by Spain, and at the *Peace of Utrecht*, 1713, were handed over to Austria. They were conquered by France in 1792-3 and held by that Power till 1815. In that year the whole of the Netherlands were again united under the new title of "the Kingdom of the Netherlands," and given to the Prince of Orange.

(2) Immediate Causes. The creation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands was regarded by the Powers in 1815, and by Great Britain in particular, as one of the most important securities for the peace of Europe. But the union was unwelcome to the Belgians; and fifteen years of Dutch control only strengthened their dislike. As Flemings and Walloons they were not unrelated to the Dutch; but their languages were different, and Dutch was maintained as the official language. Taxes were so arranged as to lie heavy on Belgian agriculturists and lightly on Dutch merchants. Above all, the difference of religion was an insuperable bar to hearty union. The Clericals of Belgium wanted supremacy in Church matters and in education, while the Dutch rule maintained an equal toleration that to them was unbearable. By 1830 the various reasons for discontent had so increased that the two anti-Dutch parties in the country, Liberal and Clerical, coalesced for the common patriotic purpose of overthrowing the common enemy; and the Parisian revolution of July merely added the spark to the piled gunpowder.

(ii) Consequences of the Revolt: (1) Existence. The Revolution was, as it were, but momentary. It was completed in the two months of August and September. But its effects as a disturbance of the European international system, were more lasting. Whether the revolution, thus easily effected, would be permitted even to exist was doubtful. Russia would willingly have marched an army to suppress the revolt at once; Prussia armed to prevent the spread of disturbance on its western border; and Austria was prevented only by its general weakness from joining to restore the *status quo*. But France was favourable to the new State, and Talleyrand won over the new Whig Ministry in Great Britain to his views. The Polish troubles hampered the action of the Eastern Powers, and Belgium was recognised as a new State.

(2) Extent. But what was to be the extent of Belgium? Was it to include Luxemburg, whose inhabitants had joined in the revolt and were represented in the Estates meeting at Brussels? For Luxemburg was in a special sense the private property of the King of the Netherlands, having been given to him in 1815 as a compensation for family territory which he had lost. The fortress also was of international importance. It was finally decided that parts of Luxemburg and Limburg should return to the Dutch crown.

(3) Dynasty. Finally, who was to be the sovereign of the new State? The Belgians were not republicans: they "wished to have a king, like the nations round about them." The dread of the Powers was lest they would choose a French prince, and that Belgium would again be the first conquest of a France again revolutionary. Louis Philippe, after playing with the pleasing idea, was at last compelled to refuse the Belgian crown for his son, the Duc de Nemours. Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, who had recently rejected the Greek crown, was at length chosen. He was related to the British royal family and was to marry a French princess, and would thus be connected with the two States who were "chaperoning" the *débutante* of European society. Thus a new State was, almost peacefully, added to the European community. The King of Holland was obstinate, and had to be compelled by a Brito-French siege of Antwerp to consent to the new arrangements. In 1839, to save his face, he abdicated his Dutch crown, leaving to his successor the task of submitting to the inevitable.

IV. **References.** Something must be known and said about the earlier history, for that alone can show that the Belgian revolt was almost "inevitable," even if the Dutch had tried to conciliate the Belgians. Among the short accounts of the revolt, special mention may be made of that in Seignobos, *Contemporary Europe*, ch. viii., which contains valuable suggestive contemporary extracts illustrating the attitude of the Belgian Clericals. The second volume of Alison's *Essays* contains a paper on "The Partition of the Netherlands."

I. Question 16. *What chances of success had the Poles in 1830? How did their rising and the Belgian revolt affect one another?*

II. **Jottings.** Poland, its internal conditions and past history. The duchy of Warsaw. The kingdom of Poland under Alexander. Failure of Liberalism. Nicholas. The revolt of 1830. Vain hopes and speedy failure. Belgian troubles prevent Western Powers intervening in Poland. Polish troubles prevent Eastern Powers intervening in Belgium.

III. Answer. (i) Condition of Poland. Poland (or rather Poland-Lithuania) had once extended from the Baltic nearly to the Black Sea. In the eighteenth century it might have been called indifferently a monarchy or a republic. Its elective king was powerless, its nobles all powerful, its peasantry practically serfs. In 1795 it suffered its third partition and disappeared from the map of Europe. Napoleon revived it, at the cost of Prussia and Austria, under the name of the "Duchy of Warsaw;" and in 1815 this Duchy was made into a new kingdom of Poland and given to Alexander of Russia, who intended to govern it in the spirit of his then Liberal ideas. But socially it was still unchanged. The nobility were self-seeking and oppressed their peasant tenants, and the religion was Roman Catholic for the most part. The Constitution which Alexander gave to the country did not work; the Diet was unruly; and the Constitution, after a fitful and chequered existence, was practically allowed to fall into abeyance.

(ii) Course of the Polish Rising. In 1830 the Polish nobles may be divided into two classes: (*a*) the *Whites,* consisting of the more powerful landowners, clerical and lay, who hoped, in conjunction with the Tsar Nicholas, gradually to reform the country and gain privileges; and (*b*) the *Reds,* the lesser nobility, supported by the students, who began to desire a revolutionary change. The Grand Duke Constantine, who governed the country for his brother, had created a Polish army, and thus given the people the training necessary for a revolutionary success. When this army was brought together for the purpose of intervening in France and Belgium the Polish nobles seized control of it, and determined to make a bid for a constitution, if not independence. They hoped for outside help, but in vain. The Western Powers were more interested in Belgium, while Austria and Prussia, though glad to see Russia hampered, were too "autocratic" to encourage rebellion in their immediate neighbourhood.

In fact, the question may very simply be answered by saying that the Poles had not the least chance of success in 1830, at least under the conditions of their country and of Europe. What might have happened if the nobles had been statesmen enough to enlist the help of the peasantry and make the revolt national is another matter, and too difficult a problem to solve. The enormous well-drilled armies, the destructive artillery and rifles, and the rapid transit which we now take for granted did not exist in 1830; and a really well organised national uprising by a small people in an indefensible country might have maintained itself even against Russia, till the Western Powers intervened. While Russia was unprepared, the Poles waited for a favourable answer from the Tsar to their petitions. When Russia was ready, all struggling was in vain against her overwhelming armies; and internal dissension only helped the way to Polish ruin. All constitutional government was forfeited; and in 1847 Poland was incorporated with the Russian Empire.

(iii) Mutual Reaction of Poland and Belgium. The mutual influence of the Belgian and the Polish risings of 1830 on one another, and the results of the risings themselves, largely turn on historical geography. The "Concert of Europe" rested on the assumption that all the Powers were equally interested in all parts of Europe. But naturally the Western Powers were more directly interested in Belgium than in Poland, and they could intervene in a small country accessible by sea against a small potentate like the King of Holland with greater ease and safety than they could intervene in a distant inland country like Poland against the powerful Emperor of Russia. So, too, Poland was accessible and was a matter of domestic concern to Russia, while Belgium was distant and its revolt interested the Tsar only as a matter of principle. Hence the Belgian revolution held the hand of the Western Powers from interfering with Russian action in Poland, except by remonstrances which were not only futile but provocative. The Polish revolt, on the other hand, by holding the attention of the Eastern Powers, made it possible for Great Britain and France to establish the independent position of Belgium. Thus, in 1830, as in the eighteenth century, Poland suffered that the West might progress.

IV. **References.** The question is treated in most histories of the period; and the second part of it is explicitly handled in Seignobos, *Contemporary Europe,* ch. xxvi. For the Polish Rising the best account available in English is to be found in the third volume of A. Rambaud, *History of Russia.* The popular histories of Poland and Russia contributed by W. R. Morfill to the "Story of the Nations," though based on extensive knowledge, are not very well put together.

I. **Question 17.** *How did the career of Mehemet Ali affect the relations between Russia, Great Britain, and France during the thirties of the nineteenth century?*

II. **Jottings.** Mehemet Ali, Vali of Egypt, 1809-1844, under the Sultan, Mahmoud II. (1808-1839) and Abdul Medjid (1839-1861). Russia desires to maintain Turkey, but in weakness. Great Britain and France, both jealous of Russian aggression, desire to maintain Turkey in its integrity. But Great Britain and France are mutually jealous about Egypt, because of India. The crisis of 1833: *Convention of Kiutayeh*, the *Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi*, and the *Convention of Münchengrätz*. The *Quadruple Alliance* of 1834 and its weakness. Crisis of 1839. *Quadruple Alliance* of 1840.

III. **Answer.** (i) The International Situation in the Levant. It was to the interest of Russia to maintain the rule of Turkey, because any proposal to end it would lead to dangers of which no one could foresee the result. On the other hand, Russia had no interest in maintaining the strength of Turkey, because she was constantly wanting to intervene on behalf of her co-religionists in Turkey; and a weak state at Constantinople served her purposes best, because such a state would always submit to Russia and be in need of her help. For the same reasons, looked at from another standpoint, Great Britain and France wished to maintain Turkey as an outpost against Russian aggression, for they were both interested in Eastern affairs and did not wish to see Russia barring their way in the Levant. But here their agreement ended. They were mutually as jealous of one another's power in the East as they were in common of Russia.

(ii) Mehemet's Ali's Prosperity, 1832-1839. When, therefore, in 1832, Mehemet Ali, the Pasha of Egypt (who had so well fought for his master), made war on the Sultan to obtain the promised reward for his services in the Greek peninsula, viz., the Pashalik of Syria, and still more when his military career was even more successful than he had hoped, the situation forced on the Powers of Europe led to a diplomatic crisis. Russia feared a total overthrow of the weak Sultan in favour of a vigorous dynasty at Constantinople, and prepared to help the Porte against its too triumphant vassal. Great Britain and France, fearing the growth of Russian influence in Turkey, also intervened. They persuaded the Sultan to make the *Convention of Kiutayeh* with his victorious enemy, and grant to Mehemet Ali the governorship of Syria and possession of certain military positions (May 5, 1833). Russia could now take advantage of the situation to pose as Turkey's better friend; and by the *Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi*, July 1833, she promised help to the Sultan whenever he should be attacked.

Great Britain and France were angry at this treaty; but as nothing further was done for some years, there was time for a change of the diplomatic situation. Tsar Nicholas was always desirous of an understanding with Great Britain; and he gradually learnt that the *Reform Acts* of 1832 had not made her a "revolutionary" Power, such as he considered France under Louis Philippe to be. He therefore set himself to separate the interests of the two Western Powers. His task was lightened by their mutual jealousies not only in the East, but also in the Iberian Peninsula. War had broken out in Portugal between Miguel, the "despotic" claimant, and Pedro with his daughter Maria, the "constitutional" sovereign of that country. In 1833 Ferdinand of Spain had died, and civil war had arisen there also between Isabella and her mother-regent, Christina, on the one hand, and Don Carlos, the "legitimist," on the other. In 1834 Great Britain and France made with the governments of Portugal and Spain a *Quadruple Alliance* against the two "pretenders," Miguel and Carlos; but British jealousy of French influence in Spain hampered action and led to coolness between the two Powers.

(iii) Mehemet Ali's Decline, 1839-1844. In 1839 the aged Sultan, Mahmoud II., renewed the war against Mehemet Ali; but his troops were defeated at Nissib, on the Euphrates. Thereupon Great Britain and Russia agreed (with Austria and Prussia) to form a new *Quadruple Alliance* against Mehemet Ali. France was totally omitted from this alliance and isolated in Europe, because she was pursuing a diplomatic policy in favour of Mehemet Ali. For a time there were threats of war between France and Europe, and the situation alarmingly suggested the period of the Great Revolution. But Louis Philippe was fearful of consequences; Guizot replaced Thiers in the French ministry; and Mehemet Ali was forced to retire to his viceroyalty of Egypt. The crisis was over, and Europe remained still "at peace." But the Brito-French *entente* was shattered; and the exchange of visits between Louis Philippe and Queen Victoria failed to restore it. Tsar Nicholas lost the rights of navigation through the Straits which he had acquired at Unkiar-Skelessi, but he had thwarted "the King of the Barricades."

IV. **References.** The general histories of Europe require supplementing by (*a*) histories of the individual states concerned, (*b*) histories of modern Egypt, *e.g.*, those by A. Cameron, Lord Milner and Sir John Scott, and (*c*) biographies of Lord Palmerston.

I. Question 18. *What was the question of the "Spanish Marriages"? What other causes led to the fall of Louis Philippe?*

II. **Jottings.** (1) *Spanish Marriages.* Bourbon Family Alliances. Rivalry of Great Britain and France in Spain. The marriage scheme and the diplomatic tangle. Apparent triumph of France. Results in France and in Great Britain.

(2) *Other causes of Louis Philippe's Fall.* Narrow basis of Louis Philippe's power; tendencies to drop the "Citizen King" pose; growth of social questions ignored by Louis Philippe; suppression of discontents. The "Spanish Marriages" and the Swiss questions. The revolution of 1848.

III. Answer. (i) The Spanish Marriages. Ever since the death of Charles II. of Spain in 1700, France and Great Britain had been rivals in the Iberian Peninsula. Great Britain had succeeded in securing Portugal as an all but permanent ally. France had still more fully succeeded in securing Spain by placing princes of the Bourbon family on the throne of that country. Many had been the alliances and marriage schemes between the cousin families: many a war had Great Britain waged to counteract the evil effect on her commerce exercised by the Bourbon family compacts. Even Napoleon had followed the same policy and placed his brother Joseph on the Spanish throne; and the greatest military war that Britain had waged against France had been that pre-eminently named *the* Peninsular War.

And now again, even after the long alliance between the House of Orleans and Great Britain, the Bourbon in 1846 was again seeking to secure a marriage alliance with Spain, out of which endless possibilities of advantage to France might arise. The plan was to marry Isabella, the young Queen of Spain, to her cousin, Francis of Assisi, Duke of Cadiz, and her sister Louisa to Antony, Duke of Montpensier, a younger son of Louis Philippe. It was confidently hoped and expected that, owing to the character of the Duke of Cadiz, Isabella would have no children, and that a French prince would thus ultimately become King-Consort of Spain. Great Britain opposed the scheme by bringing pressure to bear at Madrid on the Queen Mother Christina, and by proposing the candidature of Leopold of Coburg, a relative of the British royal family. But this proposal was not seriously pressed, Britain being content if France would wait till Isabella should have children before the marriage of the Duke of Montpensier would take place. But France hurried on both marriages, which took place simultaneously. Great Britain, thus defeated in her diplomatic game, declared the *entente* between themselves and France at an end. France was left isolated in Europe, and French public opinion was angry at their king thus losing prestige for purely dynastic purposes. In the end, too, Isabella had children, and, even if other events had not made the "Spanish marriages" a question of purely historical interest, France would have gained nothing by her scheming.

(ii) Other Causes of the Revolution of 1848. Louis Philippe had been raised to the throne of the French because the Republicans of 1830, led by Lafayette, had been willing to submit to the candidate of the parliamentary and newspaper party. He was essentially a "bourgeois" king, representing the "middle class" of France. This was satisfactory for the men of 1830-1840, for at that time the middle class probably contained the majority of Frenchmen who were interested in politics; and under Casimir-Périer, Thiers, and Guizot, France had been fairly prosperous and contented.

But about 1840 there began changes in social conditions which brought forward other elements of political life. A great increase in material wealth had developed antagonism between Capital and Labour. Socialistic schemes of redistribution began to be advocated by Fourier and Louis Blanc; and there was much unrest among the "working classes." All this was ignored by the King and his ministers. So long as the *pays légal* (*i.e.*, the men who had the parliamentary suffrage) were contented, "elements of disorder" could be suppressed or ignored, apparently with safety. But when, under Guizot's leading, Louis Philippe embarked on diplomatic schemes which led to disaster and disgrace, such as the Spanish marriages and the intervention in Switzerland on behalf of the Sonderbund, he disgusted his "middle class" supporters and lost the main support of his throne. When, therefore, in February, 1848, agitations began again in Paris, no one was interested in supporting the monarchy; and it fell even more ignominiously than in 1830. A republic was proclaimed, and another exile was raised to power—Louis Napoleon—as President of the Repub ic (December, 1848).

IV. **References.** Besides the general histories of Europe, and the histories of modern France by C. K. Adams, Bodley, Coubertin, Dickinson, and Le Bon, there are available in English many interesting accounts of the July Monarchy and its fall. Some are by active French politicians of the time (*e.g.*, Louis Blanc, Guizot, and Lamartine), some by foreign observers (*e.g.*, Heine, Lady Jackson, J. S. Mill, Lord Normanby, and Nassau Senior). A critical bibliography is appended to ch. v. of Seignobos, *Contemporary Europe.*

I. **Question 19.** *Summarise the story of the* Sonderbund *in both its internal and its external aspects.*

II. **Jottings.** The Confederations of Upper Germany and neighbouring confederations. The Helvetic Republic. Reaction in the *Federal Pact* of 1815. International position of Switzerland. Cantonal conflicts. The Progressive Party, tending to centralisation. Ultramontanism. The *Sonderbund* formed by the seven Roman Catholic cantons, 1843. Appeal to the Powers. Great Britain *v.* Eastern Powers. Palmerston's diplomacy. France checkmated.

III. **Answer.** (i) SWITZERLAND BEFORE 1815. From the fourteenth century onwards Switzerland had been gradually coming into existence, and it was formally separated from the Holy Roman Empire at the *Peace of Westphalia*, 1648. From various reasons and under varying circumstances, confederations of village communities and of small towns had grown in what was then called Upper Germany, until the greater part of modern Switzerland was thus united, in various groups with different relations to one another, together forming a loose confederation of an oligarchic type. The French Revolutionists made it into a united Helvetic Republic, "one and indivisible," like the French Republic; and this unifying work was only in part undone by Napoleon's *Act of Mediation*, 1803. In Switzerland, as in the neighbouring lands of Italy, Germany, and the Low Countries, the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Age did much to remove long-standing obstacles in the way of the development of national unity. On the fall of Napoleon, a determined attempt was made to restore the old order (or disorder); but thanks to the Tsar Alexander (who had had a Swiss tutor), some of the new arrangements were retained, especially in respect of the political equalisation of the components of Switzerland. Under the *Federal Pact* of August, 1815, the cantons (now twenty-two in number) fell apart into their old loose confederation: both internal struggles and pressure from without were necessary to weld these together.

(ii) SWITZERLAND, 1815-1843. In Switzerland, as elsewhere in Western Europe, "Restoration" led to "Reaction," and "Reaction" led to popular discontent. As the reaction progressed many inroads were made on personal liberty and privilege in many of the sovereign cantons. But gradually the Liberal (here called Radical) party grew in public opinion; and Swiss historians describe the period beginning with 1829 as the "Period of Regeneration." The goal of the Radical party was something approaching to the Helvetic Republic: at least they wished for some measure of unity. Against this the Roman Catholics struggled; and the conflict was made more bitter by the Ultramontanes, or extreme Roman party, who had re-introduced the Jesuits into some of the cantons, and who found themselves threatened by the proposal of the Radicals to suppress monasteries and generally to subordinate Church and clergy to secular control. In 1840 the anti-Clerical party suppressed eight monasteries in Aargau; and in 1843, the Diet of the Confederation, called upon to punish this breach of the Pact of 1815, laid down a compromise which satisfied neither set of extremists.

(iii) THE SONDERBUND, 1843-1847. At once seven Roman Catholic cantons formed themselves into a separate confederation *(Sonderbund)*, consisting of Luzern, Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Zug, Freiburg, and Valais. The other cantons slowly made up their minds to disperse this new confederation which threatened the disruption of the country; and the *Sonderbund* appealed to the Powers to protect the system which they had incorporated in the work of the Congress of Vienna, 1815.

France, eager to play an important part in the world, took the lead in proposing intervention, and, had it not been for the action of Great Britain, the Concert of Europe would have found another task to its hand. But Palmerston, whether to have revenge on France for her treatment of Great Britain in the question of the Spanish marriages, or to checkmate Ultramontanism and reaction, cleverly interposed diplomatic delays, and meanwhile urged the Swiss Government to end the matter by force, and present Europe with an accomplished fact before any congress could meet or at least resolve. Accordingly, in November, 1847, the *Sonderbund* was suppressed by force in a twenty-five days' campaign. France lost the opportunity of restoring her prestige in Europe; Palmerston had his triumph; and Switzerland in 1848 replaced the so-called *Federal Pact* of 1815 by a really federal constitution *(Bundesstaat* instead of *Staatenbund)*. This was a long stride towards the establishment of the highly democratic constitution which Switzerland possesses to-day.

IV. **References.** George Grote, the historian of Greece, wrote *Seven Letters concerning the Politics of Switzerland* in 1847. The best general works on Switzerland in English are *The Swiss Confederation*, by Sir F. O. Adams and C. D. Cunningham, and Dändliker, *History of Switzerland*. There are useful short accounts of Swiss institutions in Woodrow Wilson, *The State* (ch. viii.) and A. L. Lowell, *Parties and Governments in Continental Europe*.

I. Question 20. *Trace the growth of "Liberal" thought from 1830 to 1848. What were the principal outward manifestations thereof?*

II. **Jottings.** Improvements in wealth and means of communication—railways and steamships Countries already Liberal in 1830. German "constitutions." The movement in Germany: "Hampach" and Münchengrätz. The Diet useless to Liberals. Austrian censorship. The movement in Italy: Roman revolts; Mazzini and Charles Albert; Pius IX.; the "Ferrara Incident." The movement in non-German Austria: Magyar Diets—Kossuth. Czech and Illyrian agitations. Galician peasants.

III. Answer. (i) The Material Bases of Civilisation. Till 1830, Metternich had been able, on the whole, to maintain his system in Germany, Italy, and Austria, and to control, to a large extent, the international politics of Europe. After that date, however, though his authority was, at least apparently, as great as before, and even in some respects increasing, signs began to appear that it would at some time come to an end. In the settlement of the Eastern Question, 1830-40, Austria had been compelled to follow the lead of Russia; and the revolution of 1830 in France and Belgium had effected changes which, in both method and results, were unwelcome to Metternich, but of which he had to make the best he could. The world was also growing richer; material interests were developing which had been unknown before; means of communication were rapidly changing; and, as a consequence, ideas increased and were spread. The world of railways could not be the same as that of the stage coach and lumbering luggage waggon. Increase of wealth raised various classes of the population to that amount of comfort which gives leisure for thought, and for discontent.

(ii) The Old Order Changing. Most of the countries in the West were already Liberal in 1830, or were shortly to become so. In Eastern Europe, on the other hand, "despotic" governments were still maintained. The nationalist Tsar, Nicholas I., was doing his best to preserve Russia from being further polluted with Western ideas—such as Liberalism. It was mainly in Central Europe, therefore, that there was room for the development of Constitutionalism. Accordingly, the growth of Liberal thought must be traced in three groups—Germany, Italy, and the non-German lands of the Austrian Empire.

(1) Germany. Liberal thought was found in the schools and the universities. It was rigorously suppressed, as may be seen in the case of the seven Göttingen professors who protested against the suspension of the Hanoverian constitution in 1839. But books were published, pamphlets circulated, songs written, all inspired with Liberal thought, and these could not be entirely suppressed. Even in German Austria, the smaller literature escaped the censorship and was greedily devoured by Metternich's subjects. In 1832 a meeting of enthusiastic Germans at Hampach, harmless as it was, led (among other causes) to the conference at Münchengrätz in the following year, and to a conference at Vienna, when the various Governments agreed together to suppress popular movements even at the cost of constitutional struggles. The German Diet became no more than a committee of princes working for reaction.

(2) Italy. There were revolts in the Papal States in 1831-2 against clerical "misrule," but these were put down by Austrian troops. Italian aspirations, however, were represented by the thought of Mazzini, who dreamed of an Italian republic, and who saw that "nationality" must be used as a lever to bring about the cosmopolitan millennium of the future. Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, too, was an Italian "patriot," and waited only for the opportune moment to rid the peninsula of its Austrian and other "despots." Others again, like Gioberti, hoped to see a "liberal" Pope heading the Italian movement, and these thought they had attained their wishes when, in 1846, Pius IX. was chosen Pope; but his "reforms" were extremely moderate, and led only to disappointment. The "Ferrara incident" of 1847, when Austria spontaneously intervened to put down revolt, only led to angrier feeling and to Brito-French reprisals.

(3) Non-German "Austria." Here the spirit of "nationality" was growing. The Magyar nobles of Hungary, in the Diets which the Emperor found himself compelled to call, agitated more and more for the use of their own language and for autonomy. In the same spirit, but in partial opposition to the Magyars, the Czechs of Bohemia and the Slavs of Illyria were developing literary societies into political clubs. As Kossuth the Magyar began his career in 1840-1 with editing a Magyar newspaper, so Ljudevit Gaj in 1836 founded his *Illyrian National Gazette*. This growth, to a large extent unchecked, showed how weak the Austrian Government really was. In 1846 it was glad to employ peasant discontent in Galicia to help in suppressing a revolt of the Poles, and thus began to play with the revolutionary forces that were to work such effects in 1848.

IV. **References.** The ideas which manifested themselves in these events can be realised only by wide reading in contemporary literature. Some of Mazzini's essays are readily available (*e.g.*, in the "Scott Library"); and an excellent guide to the whole is furnished by George Brandes, *Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature*.

I. **Question 21.** *How far did the Revolution of 1848 succeed* (a) *in the Austrian Empire,* (b) *in Italy,* (c) *in Germany? At what point of time did it culminate?*

II. **Jottings.** *(a) Austria.* Hungarian Diet agitated during March and won a constitution. Bohemia did the same at the same time. Revolution in Vienna in March; fall of Metternich; further rioting in May; Vienna ruled by a Committee of Public Safety. Bohemia won independence of Austria in May. Constitution for Austria granted in April, and the Diet met in July. *(b) Italy.* Constitutions granted in Naples (January) and Sardinia (March); Milan revolted in March, and Sardinia declared war on Austria; Sardinia joined by Naples and the Pope in April and May; Italian arms successful, and in May-June the Kingdom of North Italy was proclaimed. *(c) Germany.* In March, revolution in Berlin gained a constitution for Prussia; the Germanic Diet agreed to recognise the German Parliament which met in May, and in July appointed an executive and a Regent.

III. **Answer.** After 1830, Germany as a whole, Prussia, Austria, and other German states were still non-Liberal; Italy was governed "despotically" by Austria, the Pope, the Bourbons, and others; Hungary and the other parts of the Austrian Empire were governed by the benevolent despotism of Francis II., or by the veiled regency that was substituted for the personal action of his successor Ferdinand. The outbreak of the French Revolution in February, 1848, and its speedy success found the material ready prepared in all these countries for further revolt, and in June some progress in that direction had already been made.

(i) In the Austrian Empire. On 3 March, Kossuth made an inflammatory speech in the Hungarian Diet at Pressburg. This aroused an agitation which resulted, in consequence of the utter weakness of the Austrian Government, in a complete success and the granting of a constitution to Hungary, according to the ideas of the nobles, before the end of the month. The Czechs of Bohemia united with their German compatriots in demanding and obtaining similar privileges for their country; and in May Bohemia gained complete independence of Austria, except so far as common allegiance to the Emperor bound them. In March also, the populace of Vienna, long discontented with Metternich's rule and permeated with Liberal ideas drawn from German pamphlets, rose in revolt and forced Metternich to immediate resignation (13 March). The mob of Vienna proceeded to imitate that of Paris; and by May the Imperial Government was compelled to recognise the Committee of Public Safety which had been erected in Vienna, and even to look to this revolutionary body to keep order in the city. Croatia, too, was petitioning for reform. In April a constitution was promulgated for the Austrian Empire, except Hungary and Italy; and a Diet, summoned under the terms of this constitution, met in July.

(ii) In Italy. These successes gained in Austria-Hungary were due to the fact that the Austrian army was fully occupied in Italy. There the Neapolitans had risen, and obtained a constitution in January; the King of Sardinia had granted a constitution in March; Milan rose in the same month, and immediately destroyed all Austrian rule, except as represented by Radetzky's army, which was obliged for a time to withdraw. Sardinia declared war on Austria in the name of Italian "freedom," and was not only joined by Naples, but also blessed and encouraged by the "Liberal" Pope, Pius IX. The campaign during the months of April and May was successful for the Italians; and in May and June the King of Sardinia thought himself justified, having "freed" Lombardy and Venetia, in proclaiming himself "King of North Italy."

(iii) In Germany. In March a meeting of German Liberals at Heidelberg arranged for the meeting of a National Parliament. Revolutions occurred everywhere, and especially in Berlin. There, in consequence of continued agitation, the King not only summoned a Diet to discuss the future constitution of Prussia, but also put himself at the head of the German Nationalist movement. In May the German National Parliament met, undisturbed by any, and proceeded during the rest of the year to evolve a constitution for "United Germany." In July it had proceeded so far as to appoint an executive government and a Regent.

To sum up. Owing to the weakness of the Austrian Government, the "Liberal" forces were everywhere triumphant. Constitutions were granted to Hungary, to Bohemia, to Austria; in Naples, Sardinia, and many German States; Germany itself began to take shape; and Italy made a successful effort to drive the "Germans" beyond the Alps. Till the summer of 1848 all was apparent success. *Then* began the reaction which in 1849 restored the *status quo.*

IV. **References.** The standard work in English is C. E. Maurice, *The Revolutionary Movement of 1848-9 in Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Germany:* see, too, the contemporary notices of the movements in periodicals like *Blackwood, Edinburgh Review,* and *Quarterly Review.* Both general and national histories deal at length with the "Year of Revolutions." A suggestive analysis of the international tendencies of the time is contained in Seignobos, *Contemporary Europe,* ch. xxii.-xxvi. (with polyglot bibliographies).

I. **Question 22.** *What did Radetzky, Windischgrätz, and Jellacic respectively do towards the reaction of 1848?*

II. **Jottings.** (1) *Radetzky*: Austrian commander in Italy; the Quadrilateral. Italian disunion; Battle of Custozza (July); Milan captured (August); Sardinia *v.* Republics; Battle of Novara (March, 1849). (2) *Windischgrätz:* Austrian commander in Bohemia; Nationalism *v.* Constitutionalism; Windischgrätz captures Prague, and wins Bohemia for Austria; capture of Vienna (1 November), and banishment of Austrian Diet. (3) *Jellacic*: in Croatia; his hostility to Magyars; his apparent opposition to the Emperor; war between Croatia and Hungary.

III. **Answer.** These three served in different parts of the Austrian dominions.

(1) Radetzky. When the Revolution broke out universally in the spring of 1848, Radetzky was in command of Austria's only effective army; and that was employed in holding what was considered the most disaffected, and therefore most dangerous, part of the Austrian possessions. Nor was this consideration mistaken. All Italy was combining against Austrian rule, and, much as there was need of military help elsewhere, none could be spared from the "Italian" army. Even here it was only by Radetzky's obstinate perseverance, against all seeming odds, that anything was preserved for the Imperial rule. Even the fortresses of the Quadrilateral, by which Austria maintained her hold, were partly conquered by Sardinia; and if Italy could have remained united, she might have gained not only her own "freedom," but also that of Austria and of Germany. Fortunately for Radetzky and his masters, Naples and the Pope drew back; and in June Radetzky was able to regain ground by recapturing Vicenza and thus recovering Venetia. Towards the end of July he won the battle of Custozza, and early in August he recaptured Milan. The war was over for the present: a six weeks' armistice was agreed upon, and the cause of Italy was lost. Not only so, but as Radetzky's army was now free for service elsewhere, the cause of the Revolution in Central Europe was also lost by the failure of Italian arms. Thus one man by endurance had saved the Austrian system. It could now reckon with its other enemies.

(2) Windischgrätz. In no country of Europe more than in Bohemia are political forces so inextricably intermingled. Nowhere else do cross purposes so reveal themselves. At first, in the excitement of March, 1848, all parties in Bohemia united together for a time to gain constitutional privileges; but the desire of Germany to include Bohemia in its national union, and to receive deputies thence to its national Parliament, made the Czechs hesitate and begin to look to the Emperor to save them from absorption into a people with which they had no sympathy. In May a Pan-Slav congress met at Prague, and under its influence Czech Bohemia gained from the Emperor independence of German Austria. Windischgrätz encouraged this movement, but when certain Liberal Czechs began to agitate for further constitutional reform he withdrew from Prague and bombarded the city into submission. Thus Czech *national* aspirations were used by the Imperial Government to checkmate the similar hopes of Germans and Magyars; but their *constitutional* desires were crushed in the cause of the unity of the Austrian Empire. In the Austrian Diet which sat from July to November the Slav deputies from Bohemia and Croatia were in the majority as against their German fellow-subjects. Later, in November, Windischgrätz was able, with his army, to capture Vienna, the seat of Austrian-German disaffection, and thus help to complete the general reaction.

(3) Jellacic. In the spring of 1848, when other nationalities were getting all they wanted, simply by demanding it from the helpless Imperial Government, the Croatian petition was rejected by the authorities, who had not then realised how useful Slav loyalty might be to them in the dire straits to which they were reduced. But when, shortly afterwards, Jellacic was appointed Ban of Croatia, the Magyar nobles, more shrewd in their estimation of the hostility between Slav and Magyar, began an agitation for his removal from office. The Hungarian nationalists knew clearly Jellacic for an enemy. The Emperor was not so clear, for Jellacic in his part of through-going advocate of Imperial unity, appeared at first as dangerous as the Magyars. To prevent Magyar control, he demanded, and obtained from the helpless Emperor, a constitution for Croatia. Subsequently, the Emperor acceded to the demands of the Magyars, and dismissed his too independent Ban. But Jellacic, secure in the support of the Croatians and their neighbours (the "Triune Kingdom"), defied the Emperor's commands, and formed an army with which, at last, in September, he declared war, not against the Emperor, but against the Emperor's enemies, the Magyar nobles. This declaration of war by Jellacic, leading the Slavs against the Magyars, was the beginning of the struggle which ended in the fall of the Hungarian constitution, and in the restored unity of the Austrian Empire.

IV. **References.** The ordinary histories, general and national, may profitably be supplemented by C. E. Maurice, *The Revolutionary Movement of 1848-9 in Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Germany.*

I. **Question 23.** *What were the causes* (a) *of the Magyar success in* 1848, *and* (b) *of the subsequent failure?*

II. **Jottings.** Magyars, neither German nor Slav. Between Turkey and Austria. A militant nobility. Kossuth and Magyar nationalism. The Diet and the Pesth revolutionary party. The Twelve Points and the March Laws. Austrian weakness. Magyar *v.* Croat. The Slav movement. Windischgrätz and Jellacic. Slav *v.* Magyar. Autumn, 1848. The reaction apparently successful. January, 1849. The war in 1849. Russian intervention.

III. **Answer.** (i) WHO ARE THE MAGYARS? The Magyars, properly speaking, are no more a European people than the Turks. In the ninth century they conquered the country which we call Hungary, thrusting themselves like a wedge among the Slav peoples, and dwelling on the south-eastern borders of Germany. Their later history consisted mainly of conflict with the Turks, and they found salvation from Muhammadanism only in their subjection to the Hapsburg Emperors. The alliance had never been a very friendly one, and was only one more element in the strange "race" conflicts which at the same time maintain and weaken the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Magyars may be said to have risen to equality with the other peoples in the Austrian dominions when Maria Theresa, in the eighteenth century, appealed to them for help against Prussia. The Magyars were a militant nobility ruling the peasants of their lands on feudal principles until, in 1848, they freed the peasantry in order to unite all in the struggle for "freedom."

(ii) WHY DID THE MAGYARS SUCCEED IN 1848? In Hungary the agitation for national and constitutional reform centres specially round the person of Kossuth. He had for eight years before 1848 been working as a journalist to arouse Magyar feeling to the point of revolt; and when, early in March, the news of the French Revolution of February reached Pressburg, where the Hungarian Diet was sitting, Kossuth made a speech which set the nation on fire. At first the Diet at Pressburg, and shortly afterwards the revolutionary party at Pesth, led the nation; and from the Imperial Government —helpless because all its troops were in Italy—the Magyars wrung an assent to a revolutionary programme. Under the name of the "Twelve Points" and the "March Laws," all that was desired by Liberals of 1848 was granted to Hungary. Freedom of the Press, Trial by Jury, a representative Chamber, and many other "checks" on the executive were adopted in a moment. Magyarism at Pesth and Germanism at Vienna joined hands to overwhelm the government of Metternich, and triumphed.

(iii) WHY DID THE MAGYARS FAIL IN 1849? But the national feeling which, as Magyarism, had triumphed in Hungary, had also displayed itself in Bohemia and Croatia. The Slavs were in no mood to submit to Magyar control, any more than the Roumanian peasants of Transylvania; and when Windischgrätz had in Bohemia crushed the Liberalism of the Czechs and won their national spirit to the Emperor, and Jellacic had made good his position in Croatia as against Magyar arrogance and Imperial weakness, the Imperial Government used the Slav forces, thus placed at its disposal, to regain the position in Hungary which it had lost in March. In September, 1848, Jellacic declared war on Hungary, and the Austrian Diet declared for the equality of *all* languages in the Empire. The murder of Lemberg only added bitterness to the coming strife; and when, in December, Ferdinand resigned his crown, his successor, Francis Joseph, considered himself free from his uncle's pledges, and prepared to subdue Magyar "revolt." In January, 1849, the war was apparently over, and the Magyar cause had failed. How the Magyars found courage in despair; how they all but captured Vienna; how they quarrelled among themselves, and thus lost advantages which they might have gained; how they finally declared themselves independent, and thus gave to Nicholas of Russia what he regarded as the right to intervene; and how Magyar "freedom" was finally trampled under the feet of Russian troops—all this belongs to the year 1849.

The Magyars succeeded at first because their enthusiasm found nothing to withstand it. They fell when Austria was itself again, though even thus Russian help was required to beat down Magyar despair.

IV. **References.** The standard work remains C. E. Maurice, *The Revolutionary Movement of 1848-9 in Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Germany*. More particular accounts are given in Stiles, *Austria in 1848-9;* in Count Hartig, *Details of the late Austrian Revolution* (Appendix to Coxe's *House of Austria*, vol. iv. in "Bohn's Library"); and in an anonymous work entitled *Hungary: its History and Revolution, together with a copious Memoir of Kossuth*, in Bohn's Library. The Memoirs of Déák and Kossuth have both been translated into English; and General Klapka's account of the "War of Independence in Hungary" was published in London in 1850. For the general antecedents see L. Léger, *Austria-Hungary;* A. Vambéry, *Hungary* (S.N.), and the more popular books of Sidney Whitman, *Austria* (S.N.), and *The Realm of the Hapsburgs*. E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geography of Europe*, ch. viii. §9, traces clearly the agglomeration of Austria-Hungary; and there is a good ethnological map of Austria-Hungary in Phillips, *Modern Europe* (to be compared with Putzger, Pl. 28*a*).

I. Question 24. *Account for the failure of the German Parliament, and mention the chief incidents in its career.*

II. **Jottings.** Reform meetings at Heppenheim (September 1847), at Heidelberg (March 1848). Committee of Seven. Ante-Parliament (*Vor-Parlament,* or National Convention) at Frankfort. Committee of Fifty. National Parliament (a "constituent assembly"), May 18. Election of an executive and a Regent; the Schleswig-Holstein incident; Germany cannot enforce its will; Shall all Austria be part of Germany? Election of Frederick William IV. of Prussia as Emperor; his refusal; practical end of the Parliament.

III. Answer.

The movement of 1848 for German national unity and for constitutional government was the work of enthusiasts, mainly of university professors and students, who never became practical enough for success, and whose enthusiasm came into conflict too early with those of other peoples. Its failure may be more specifically ascribed to its inability to overcome four incidents or obstacles which came in its way.

(1) **Czech Difficulty.** The story of the Parliament began early in March, 1848, when a meeting of several German nationalists took place at Heidelberg. They appointed a Committee of Seven who were to make preparation for a Parliament. This Committee was followed on 31 March by a *Vor-Parlament,* or Preparatory Parliament of representatives for all Germany. This Convention sat for five days and appointed a Committee of Fifty to arrange for the German National Parliament which, having been elected by universal suffrage on the basis of one deputy to each 50,000 inhabitants, met at Frankfort, 18 May. The new assembly met with no opposition from the now discredited German Diet, but a sign of future troubles was visible at the very outset. As a result of Czech-German conflicts in Bohemia, no representatives came from that country.

(2) **Danish Difficulty.** Their second difficulty came from the North. The King of Denmark was also Duke of Schleswig and of Holstein, and was desirous of incorporating the duchies into his kingdom, the more as his heir was childless and the dying out of male heirs might lead, inasmuch as the Salic Law prevailed in the duchies but not in the kingdom, to a total separation of the duchies from the kingdom. But the inhabitants of Schleswig-Holstein mostly spoke German, and therefore imagined themselves to be German in "race," and Holstein had been a member of the Holy Roman Empire. Enthusiasts for German nationalism, therefore, became excited over the Schleswig-Holstein question, which became critical when Christian VIII. of Denmark died early in 1848. The German Parliament ordered the King of Prussia (who, since the Berlin revolution of March, had been favourable to the national liberal cause) to occupy the Duchies in their name. The Northern Powers, however, Denmark, Sweden and Russia, were opposed to the separation of the Duchies from Denmark; after much hesitation the King of Prussia at last withdrew from the position into which his Germanism had led him; and the Danish Party prevailed. This incident occupied the whole of the summer and early autumn.

(3) **Austrian Difficulty.** Meanwhile, the Parliament had been endlessly discussing the foundation of a constitution for Germany, with much academic skill but little practical result. In November they at last decided to include in the future Germany the German parts of Austria, leaving out Hungary, etc. But by this time the reaction had so far triumphed in Austria over its difficulties of the spring and summer that the Imperial Government had decreed a constitution for the *whole* of "Austria," in which all its subject peoples and languages were to be included on equal terms; and accordingly, in opposition to the German national feeling, it now insisted that *all* Austria was to be included in the Germany that was to be. The question was never solved, and Germanism thus received a third defeat.

(iv) **Prussian Difficulty.** In the spring of 1849, they made a final effort to establish a national German government. They had already provided themselves with an executive and a Regent. Now they resolved to revive the mediæval Empire and to offer the crown thereof to the Prussian King. But by this time, Frederick William IV. had become disillusioned with "the glorious German Revolution," and he refused the offer. With his rejection of the Imperial crown the whole movement collapsed. The more moderate members of the Parliament left Frankfort, and its later doings are without interest.

IV. **References.** Scattered notices of the German Parliament are contained in the usual histories, large or small, of Germany or Europe. There is a short connected analytic account in Seignobos, *Contemporary Europe*, ch. xii. In 1849 W. Howitt published a book describing *Life in Germany.* An excellent summary of German history since 1806 is given in the supplementary chapter of J. Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire;* and there is a longer account in W. Müller, *Political History of Recent Times.* Comments on the German Parliament are found in the various biographies by C. Lowe, M. Busch, and J. W. Headlam (H.N.). Mr. Headlam has in preparation a *History of Germany* 1815-1890 (C. H. S. 2 vols.), which, like his *Bismarck*, will probably be the best book on the subject in English.

I. Question 25. *Tell the history of the German Constitution,* 1814-1848.

II. **Jottings.** *Treaty of Chaumont,* March, 1814, enacted that Germany was to be a confederation of independent sovereign princes, in which, by the *First Treaty of Paris,* 30 April, 1814, the Free Cities were included. This was worked out in detail at the Congress of Vienna, May-June, 1815. The Diet was to consist of two assemblies. In 1819-20 the *Carlsbad Decrees* and the *Final Act of Vienna* further interpreted the Constitution in a reactionary sense. In 1833, in consequence of the Conferences at Münchengrätz and Vienna, the Diet made further reactionary rules. In 1848, a programme of reform was proposed at Heidelberg; and Prussia took the lead in the "national" movement. The Diet consented to the meeting of a German Parliament, the programme for which was planned by a *Vor-Parlament* or "Convention" in March-April. In May, 1848, the German National Parliament met, and got to work in the autumn; but its ideals were impracticable, and conflicted with others—Danish, Austrian, etc. Finally, when in April, 1849, the King of Prussia refused the Imperial crown, which the Parliament had offered, the movement failed and the Parliament gradually dispersed.

III. **Answer.** (i) German Confederation, 1815. The two or three hundred sovereign states of which Germany was composed in the eighteenth century had been reduced by the Napoleonic war to thirty-nine. These were of greatly differing size and importance, Austria and Prussia being by far the two greatest. By the *Treaty of Chaumont* and the *First Treaty of Paris,* 1814, it was arranged by the Powers that Germany should be a confederation of independent sovereign princes, among whom the Free Cities were also to count. By the *Act of Confederation* (May-June, 1815) all members of the confederation were to have equal rights; and the Diet, which was to consist of representatives of all the German governments, was to work out the details. By the *Final Act* of this year the Diet was to consist of a Narrower Assembly (*Engere Versammlung*)—wherein the eleven greater states had one vote each, while the others had six votes among them—and a General Assembly (*Plenum*), in which a two-thirds majority was necessary for ordinary measures, and a unanimous vote for fundamentals (Art. 7). Article 13 ambiguously required all German States to have Assemblies of Estates (*landständische Verfassung*). The Diet was more like an international congress of ambassadors than like a domestic parliament: it had no executive authority under its control.

(ii) German Particularism, 1819-1847. In 1819, in consequence of agitation in Germany, and especially the murder of Kotzebue, Austria and Prussia agreed at Teplitz in August; and their resolutions were confirmed by a conference of eight governments at Carlsbad in September. The Diet met in the next year and was compelled to adopt their resolutions. The *Carlsbad Decrees* enacted various repressive measures against the Universities, the Press, and popular agitation in general. By the *Final Act of Vienna,* sanctioned by the Diet in June, 1820, all provincial constitutions must be monarchical, and must not be obtained by force. The Revolutions of 1830 were followed by the Conventions of Münchengrätz and Vienna in 1833: these made it still more possible for Metternich to control the Diet, which henceforth represented only the princes. Its attitude towards the Liberal movement in Hanover fully illustrates this. Thus till 1848 the German constitution was worked through its Diet in the interests of Austria and according to the policy of Metternich.

(iii) German Nationalism, 1848. In the spring of 1848 the continuous agitation beneath the surface began to show itself more openly. A meeting of Liberals at Heidelberg in March put forward a programme of reform; and the King of Prussia (though in a hesitating and doubtful way) put himself at the head of the movement. On 30 March the Diet was induced to declare for the meeting of a German National Parliament; and a Convention or *Vor-Parlament* meanwhile (31 March—4 April) arranged the constitution of the Parliament which was to meet. It met on 18 May and discussed much, but it was ineffectual for any permanent good. In the Schleswig-Holstein question it came into collision with Denmark and Danish national feeling, and Prussia after hesitation refused to carry out its wishes. It was opposed by the Austrian authorities, who were making a constitution for that empire, and were determined that Austria should lead in the new Germany that was to be. The results of the fighting in Hungary, Bohemia, and Austria were favourable to the Austrian authorities; and when the King of Prussia, in April 1849, finally refused the imperial crown of Germany which the Parliament offered to him, the possibility of effecting the political unification of Germany on a national basis disappeared for the present: Germany, like Italy, still remained "a geographical expression."

IV. **References.** C. M. Andrews and C. Seignobos differ from the other general histories of Europe in giving a connected account of this subject: the former is long and narrative (ch. vi.), the latter short and analytic. Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire,* traces the history of Germany 1806-1870 with a master-hand; G. B. Malleson, *Refounding of the German Empire,* deals with the subject as one of "the Events of our own Time"; and W. Wilson, *The State,* ch. vii., gives a useful short sketch of institutional development in Germany (with a bibliography). For the constitutional ideals of the time see George Brandes, *Main Currents of Nineteenth Century Literature,* vols. ii., vi. There is no good history of Germany in English.

I. **Question 26.** *Trace carefully the chief events of Prussian history,* 1814-1848, (a) *internal,* (b) *external. Had the change of sovereigns any effect?*

II. **Jottings.** Frederick William III., 1797-1840. Acquisitions in 1814-1815. Rivalry with Austria in the German Confederation. For the German people against the Princes. A constitution promised in 1815, but constantly postponed. Reasons for this. Administrative reform. Tariff reform and the Zollverein. Outmanœuvred by Austria and henceforward followed her lead. Frederick William IV., 1840-1861. The United Diet in 1847. Revolution in Berlin, March, 1848. The Schleswig-Holstein affair. Reaction in November, 1848. Rejection of the German Emperorship.

III. **Answer.** The period 1814-1848 was divided between two Prussian reigns.

(i) FREDERICK WILLIAM III., **1797-1840.** Prussia had suffered much in the Napoleonic period, and though the King sympathised with the enthusiasm for Germany, which had united, 1812-1815, to overthrow Bonaparte, his many sorrows had taught him caution.

(1) **Prussian Policy.** In the inspiration of the national movement, the King had promised to give to his various subjects a constitution; and this promise he always intended to fulfil when the suitable time should arrive. But that happy moment did not come in his lifetime; and indeed the changes that came to Prussia, even at the moment of the promise, made its fulfilment increasingly difficult, perhaps even impossible. Those changes consisted in a vast expansion. To the nucleus of German Brandenburg and Wendish Prussia were now added Pomerania (acquired from Sweden), half Saxony, Polish Posen, and the Rhinelands inhabited by Roman Catholics, of a different religion, therefore, from the Lutheran inhabitants of the old Margraviate. So cautious a politician as Frederick William III. might well believe the only possible bond of union among such heterogeneous populations to be a common allegiance to an absolute monarch.

(2) **German Policy.** In his German policy the interests of Prussia led him to a more liberal programme. Prussia and Austria were still, as they had been for nearly a century, rivals in Germany; and as Austria, under the leading of Metternich, maintained the power of the monarchs who together made up the governments of Germany, Prussia sympathised more with the feeling of German nationality. But in 1815-1818 Austria managed to outwit Prussia in the German Diet; and before long the foolishness of some German enthusiasts brought about the reaction in which Prussia quietly followed the lead of Austria.

(3) **Zollverein.** Constitutionalism and Nationalism proving thus but sorry dreams, Prussia fell back on the basis of material interests. While Metternich busied himself with diplomacy, the Prussian ministers carried out a series of administrative reforms, specially in finance and tariff reform. All internal "customs" among the various states composing the Kingdom of Prussia were abolished; and then, by bringing heavy pressure to bear (by means of high transit dues) on her neighbours, especially on those whose territories were almost surrounded by portions of the Prussian Kingdom, she inaugurated and built up her famous Zollverein, or Customs-Union. Beginning in 1819 with a convention with the petty principality of Schwarzburg-Sondershausen, it grew till all Central and Southern Germany was included in its beneficent rule.

(ii) FREDERICK WILLIAM IV., **1840-1861.** In 1840 Frederick William III. was succeeded by his son, Frederick William IV.; and for some years it seemed as if the change of sovereigns had brought no change to the Prussian policy. But the son was more dreamy and less cautious than the father in both his own and confederate concerns.

(1) **Prussian Policy.** In 1845, when Europe was full of unrest, he announced his intention to summon that United Diet for all his dominions which his father had never ventured to call. In vain did Russia and Austria warn him against the consequences. The Diet met in the spring of 1847, and, though its composition was thoroughly feudal, it entered immediately into a contest with its King. He was determined to have nothing to do with a "constitution": the members of his United Diet demanded to be treated as representatives of the people. The consequence was its dissolution in June, having achieved no result except to increase the unrest and create alarm.

(2) **German Policy.** In the following March the explosion came, not only in Prussia, but throughout all Europe. The King of Prussia, unwilling to put down the Berlinese agitators by violence, yielded to their demands, summoned a United Diet for April, and for some time figured as the leader of the German national movement. But various practical difficulties dissipated his dreams: in November he dispersed his Diet by force, and five months later he declined the Imperial crown of Germany.

IV. **References.** The student should collect the scattered notices of Prussia in his European histories and compare them with the connected account given *sub* PRUSSIA in the better encyclopædias. A. Forbes, *William of Germany*, contains a biographical sketch of Prussian history, 1813-1870: see, too, the first volume of H. von Sybel, *Founding of the German Empire*. Two facing maps (No. 30) in Putzger clearly show the territorial development of Brandenburg-Prussia.

I. **Question 27.** *Discuss the character of Alexander I., illustrating your answer from his history.*

II. **Jottings.** Alexander I., Tsar 1801-1825 (father murdered after the "Battle of the Baltic") Early friendship for Napoleon. Later disillusionment. Attitude towards France, 1814-1815. The *Holy Alliance.* The Kingdom of Poland. Violence of Liberalism. Alexander's gradual change. The Greek question. Alexander's weariness.

III. **Answer.** Few statesmen have attracted greater attention to their personal character and opinions than the Emperor Alexander I. of Russia; and none perhaps has more puzzled both contemporary observers and later historians.

(i) Alexander and Napoleon, **1801-1815.** Alexander became Tsar of All the Russias in 1801, when Bonaparte was just settling into power as First Consul; and he outlived Napoleon's rule by ten years. He personally admired Napoleon; and it was against the wishes of his Court and nobility that he made the *Treaty of Tilsit* in 1807. That alliance was the beginning of the breach between the two Emperors. Even Alexander found the ruin of his country by Napoleon's "Continental System" too high a price to pay for such friendship; and the invasion of Russia in 1812 turned Alexander into a determined foe of Bonaparte. But his quarrel with the Emperor did not lead him to hate France; and in 1814-15 his voice was decided and powerful on the side of mercy to the country that had suffered from Napoleon not less than others. In these years, too, to replace Napoleon, he had conceived a personal affection for Frederick William III. of Prussia, a friendship which lasted till the end of his life: and in 1815 he met Madame de Krudener, a Russo-Swiss mystic, whose influence was predominant for some years.

(ii) The Holy Alliance, **1815-1818.** Under these influences, Alexander was now a Liberal, believing religiously in nationalism and constitutional "liberty"—at least for every country but Russia. He obtained for himself from the other Powers the Kingdom of Poland in order that he might govern that country as a constitutional monarch and with the co-operation of a Diet; and, more than this, he issued proposals for the famous *Holy Alliance.* He thought it possible to base the international relationships of Europe on the principles of the Christian religion. What he meant by this was a puzzle to his contemporaries, and is evidently too large a subject for us to treat now. Metternich of Austria used it for his own purpose of maintaining "law and order" in Europe, and gradually converted it into an alliance of governments against the forces of "disorder" that threatened the established system in Austria and in Europe generally.

(iii) Alexander and Metternich, **1819-1825.** Between 1815 and 1820, even Alexander himself was gradually weaned from his high aspirations. The murder of his agent, Kotzebue, was only one among many events (perhaps the most striking of them) which changed Alexander's views. He was disappointed, too, with his Polish Diets, and came to take the position that Liberalism was good only when it did not oppose governments with violence. When the Greek question arose in 1822, he was beginning to weary of life, and to desire to end his days in peace. He could not refuse to do something for the cause of "Orthodox" Christians, for he was the official head of that branch of the Christian Church, but he knew and appreciated the difficulties of the diplomatic situation. He died in 1825, when the tangle was most complicated; and his attitude is best understood by contrast with that of his younger brother and successor, who immediately took up a more vigorous course of action, and in whose days war broke out between Russia and Turkey.

Without presuming to judge the man, we may venture to regard Alexander as a monarch with strong desires for personal friendship, and with high aspirations in politics, both internal and international, but whose career was doomed to successive disappointments, for whom the world was too much, and who at last grew tired of striving for political objects, even when their advantages were both obvious and attainable. Such "world-weariness" is by many critics regarded as the dominant note of the Russian novelists who began to make their mark not long after the death of Alexander I.

IV. **References.** The general histories of Europe provide adequate materials for answering this question: opinions, contemporary and later, on the Tsar's character should be collected. For greater details, A. Rambaud, *History of Russia,* vol. iii., the *Memoirs of Prince Czartoryski,* 1795-1806, and Clarence Ford, *Life and Letters of Madame de Krudener* (1766-1824) may be consulted. The Lives and Memoirs of men like Castlereagh, Metternich, and Wellington also contain first-hand impressions of the Tsar. The account given by a contemporary Englishman, E. D. Clarke, of his travels in Russia, 1816-1824, is to be found in some libraries.

I. **Question 28.** *In what ways did the Eastern Question chiefly affect European politics for the twenty years after the Treaty of Adrianople?*

II. **Jottings.** *Treaty of Adrianople*, 1829: Mahmoud II. of Turkey and Nicholas I. of Russia (Polignac: Wellington). (i) Immediate: Great Britain and France resolved that Greece must be independent. Consequent settlement of the Greek question. (ii) Later: Mehemet Ali's career developed. (*a*) Russia's growth of influence, (*b*) British distrust thereof, (*c*) Breach between Great Britain and France. These points illustrated by the *Convention of Kiutayeh* and the *Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi* in 1833 and the *Quadruple Alliance* of 1840.

III. **Answer.** The Eastern Question during this period was successively centred on two regions—Greece and Egypt—and in each case it revealed notable divergences of view among the "Christian" Powers of Europe.

(i) The Question of Greece, 1829-1833. The *Treaty of Adrianople* in 1829 suddenly ended the Russo-Turkish war which, after long threatening, broke out soon after the accession of the Tsar Nicholas I. Russia's unexpected success led the Western Powers to fear more than ever the results of Russian influence over Turkey; and whereas they had previously aimed at maintaining, as far as possible, the integrity of Turkey, they now wished to make Greece not merely "autonomous," but completely independent, so as to diminish the area of Russian influence. By using both military and diplomatic means, they finally placed Otho of Bavaria on the throne of Greece in 1833.

(ii) The Question of Egypt, 1833-1840. No sooner had this matter been settled than the ambition of Mehemet Ali of Egypt started another series of events in the East to which the attention of Europe was directed for another ten years. The ambitious viceroy's "dutiful" revolt against the Sultan and the success of his arms naturally brought Russia forward to the help of her *protégé*: it was at once her duty (under the *Treaty of Adrianople*) and her interest (for "they that are whole have no need of a physician") to protect the "sick man" against the strong man. The Russian action, as naturally, stirred again the jealousy of the Western Powers.

The question between Great Britain and Russia is one which will perhaps never be settled. Russia has often protested her pacific intentions and her wish to do nothing in the East without the participation, or at least the consent, of the rest of Europe. British ministers have as often acted on the assumption that these protests are insincere and that the Russians have selfish designs on Turkey. This general question is beyond our ability to solve; but the outward events of 1833 are clear. Great Britain and France mediated between Turkey and Egypt; and in the *Treaty of Kiutayeh*, the Sultan, under their guidance, granted to Mehemet Ali much of what he desired. Immediately afterwards, in the *Convention of Unkiar-Skelessi*, Russia promised to help Turkey against her enemies.

When the war was renewed in 1839, the condition of things was somewhat changed. Russia now persuaded Great Britain to act together with the three Eastern Powers against Mehemet Ali, and France was isolated in Europe. The reason for the possibility of this situation was that Great Britain and France were also mutually jealous of one another's influence in Egypt. This jealousy has had illustrations from the battle of the Nile down to the battle of Tel-el-Kebir. In 1840 it led to angry feelings in France and almost to war. But France was afraid of going to extremities, and her repulse in this phase of the Eastern Question acted as a nail in the coffin of Louis Philippe's monarchy. For a time, though still not heartily in agreement, Great Britain and Russia had acted together in the East; and when Tsar Nicholas came to London in 1844 he proposed that the two Powers should unite to wind up the affairs of the Ottoman Empire in Europe. The proposal was not accepted; and consequently ten years later the first war since Waterloo between Great Powers in Europe broke out on the Eastern Question.

IV. **Remarks.** (1) Attention is drawn to the comment made above on the Brito-Russian attitude in the East. Students should adopt some such treatment of difficult questions rather than the unfortunately too common one of attempting a solution of matters which are still in dispute even among the deepest scholars. They are not expected to solve all problems in history: all that is required is to show a satisfactory knowledge of the factors in such problems. Many questions are entirely insoluble, and are put in examination papers merely to test the knowledge and skill of the candidates in stating the difficulty.

(2) Attention may also be called to the historical geography of the Eastern Question. The past history is well stated and illustrated with useful maps in Freeman, *Historical Geography of Europe*. But the potential political geography of the future depends on new facts. It is obvious, from a mere inspection of the map, that it is as natural that Russia should strive for southward expansion to the open sea as that the British Isles should form a single state. There are three possible ways: Which be they?

V. **References.** The subject is treated connectedly in Lodge, *Modern Europe*, ch. xxviii., and in Seignobos, *Contemporary Europe*, ch. xxv., xxvi.; dispersedly in the other short histories of modern Europe. Biographies and Memoirs of Guizot, Metternich and Palmerston contain the opinions of the most influential statesmen; also S. L. Poole, *Life of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe*. The official documents and treaties are printed with introduction and notes in T. E. Holland, *The European Concert in the Eastern Question*.

I. **Question 29.** *What were the territorial arrangements of 1814-1815? What changes in them had taken place before the end of 1848?*

II. **Jottings.** Basis, Treaty of Chaumont, March, 1814: formal settlement at "Congress" of Vienna, 1814-5. Germany to consist of Austria, Prussia, and thirty-eight other States. Austria to receive Krakau, Venice, Lombardy. Prussia much increased North-west and East: question of her compensation for losses in Poland. Saxony to lose, and Bavaria to gain. Finland and Poland to Russia. The Netherlands and Luxemburg joined as a barrier against France. Switzerland. In Italy, Sardinia to have Genoa. Restorations. Denmark loses Norway to Sweden. Great Britain, and colonial settlements. France restricted to boundary of 1789, modified.

III. **Answer.** (i) TERRITORIAL ARRANGEMENTS, **1814-1815.**

(1) **Germany.** Instead of the Holy Roman Empire with its three hundred "sovereign princes," there was to be a German Confederation consisting of Austria, Prussia, and thirty-eight other States. Of these four were kingdoms, eight grand duchies, eleven duchies, eleven principalities, and four free cities. Austria became president of this confederation, but received no extension of territory in Germany—only keeping Salzburg instead of her abandoned territories in Swabia. Prussia obtained various readjustments of territory by way of compensation for losses: in exchange for Lauenburg she received the rest of Pomerania from Sweden; she acquired the northern half of Saxony; in addition to her shares in the two first partitions of Poland she had Posen and the town of Thorn; and by way of satisfaction for losing much of her gains in the third partition, she received the Rhenish Provinces. The kingdom of Bavaria received the district round Mainz, formerly known as the Lower Palatinate.

(2) **Non-Germany.** Most of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw (Napoleon's creation) became the kingdom of Poland, and was given to the Tsar Alexander, who also received Finland from Sweden; though neither of these can be said to have been added to *Russia*. Great Britain caused the Powers to establish as a barrier against French aggression in the north a new kingdom for the house of Orange, made out of the United and the Austrian Netherlands of former times; and to increase the strength of this kingdom it was associated with the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, a member of the German Confederation. Switzerland was re-modelled and enlarged in the West at the cost of France.

In Italy, the King of Sardinia, besides receiving back Savoy, etc., now acquired Genoa, which gave him a sea-board; Austria received back her old territory of Lombardy (the Milanese), and her more recent acquisitions, Venetia and her Dalmatian dependencies; the Pope was restored to his possessions, as were also other Italian princes.

Denmark lost Norway to Sweden and received only small compensation, viz., the duchy of Lauenburg. But then, she, like Saxony, had remained an ally of France for some time longer than her neighbours; and she had to suffer for her loyalty or indiscretion. France was reduced to her boundaries of 1789, except that she retained the enclaves of Avignon and the Venaissin on the Rhone. This territorial reduction was not intended to be so complete until after Napoleon's Hundred Days. That escapade cost her Chambéry and other parts of Savoy. Great Britain gained, in Europe, Heligoland from Denmark, Malta, and the protectorate of the Ionian Isles.

(3) **Non-Europe.** There were further rearrangements of colonial territory among the Atlantic Powers. Great Britain received Trinidad from Spain, Mauritius, Tobago and St. Lucia from France. She also made some significant exchanges with Holland: she received Ceylon and the Cape of Good Hope, which helped to build up her Indian Empire, but she gave back to Holland the islands of the Farther East, *e.g.*, Java, and also Curaçao, etc. France received from Great Britain Martinique and the Isle de Bourbon, from Sweden Guadeloupe, and from Portugal Cayenne and her share of Guiana.

(ii) TERRITORIAL CHANGES, **1815-1848.** There were many territorial changes affecting European Powers—especially outside Europe—during the generation which followed the battle of Waterloo; but only two of these modified the arrangements of 1814-5, viz., the separation of Holland and Belgium in the thirties and the annexation by Austria of the Polish Republic of Krakau in 1846. The establishment of the kingdom of Greece in 1833 was not technically a change in "the territorial arrangements of 1814-5," for the Eastern Question had not been among the agenda of the Congress of Vienna.

IV. **Remarks.** This answer might be much simplified in both matter and method; but it is at any rate less vague and incoherent than the question, which is a typical examination question. The reasons for and against these territorial arrangements actually made or suggested are more important than the territorial arrangements themselves.

V. **References.** The arrangements are given, variously grouped, in the several histories of Europe, in which the Congress of Vienna is either a starting, or a stopping, or a passing, point. They require illustration by a map, and by reference to the past: the best place to find both is in E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geography of Europe*. Two of the maps in Putzger, Plate 28A, show how far the settlement at Vienna was from being based on the "principle of Nationality" (so far as that is based on "Race").

I. Question 30. *What European Powers had colonies in the years* 1814-1848? *What effect did their possession have on European politics?*

II. **Jottings.** (1) *Colonial Powers*, 1814-1848. Great Britain: dependencies; colonies proper—original (Australia), conquered (Canada, Cape); plantations and stations, etc. France: Africa, N. and W.; India; West Indies; Bourbon. Spain: America, mostly in revolt, except Florida (to U. S. A. 1819); West Indies; Philippines; Fernando Po. Portugal: India; Brazil; Africa, E. and W. Holland: Indies, E. and W. (exchanges, etc., 1815). Sweden and Denmark: in West Indies. Russia: internal colonisation.

(2) *Effects:* Spanish Colonies, Russian expansion eastwards, Monroe Doctrine and Canning; Great Britain and the route to Far East (hence partly Mediterranean anxieties); Rivalry between Great Britain and France in Mediterranean (Ionian Isles, Malta, Levant, Egypt, Morocco); French desire to make up for old losses—hence new attempts in Africa and in Pacific (New Zealand, etc.), especially under Louis Philippe.

III. Answer. (i) The Colonial Powers of the period fall into three groups: (*a*) Great Britain; (*b*) the six Atlantic Powers of the Continent (Sweden and Denmark being of little importance); and (*c*) Russia (in Siberia and Alaska).

(ii) The Influence of Colonies on European Politics, **1814-1848.** The *Peace of Paris* left Great Britain in the position (of which she was herself scarcely conscious) of a World-Power, and in one way or another gave all the Colonial Powers of the Continent some cause of annoyance with her.

(1) **Spanish Colonies.** Under cover of the Peninsular War, most of the colonies of the Spanish Main made good the claims to independence which had been encouraged by the American and French Revolutions; and in the European Congresses of 1820-1823 there was much talk (not without hope of reward) of European intervention to restore these "revolutionary" republics to the rule of Ferdinand VII. This would have been contrary to the commercial interests of Great Britain and to the political interests of the United States of America: hence in 1823 George Canning and James Monroe, independently but in co-operation, prevented the proposed intervention. The Monroe Message was directed not only against the re-establishment of Bourbon influence, French or Spanish, in South America, but also against the threatened extension of Russian power southwards from Alaska into the no man's land of California.

(2) **Portuguese Colonies**—mainly Brazil. During the twenties Great Britain protected Portugal from French conquest and paid herself by helping Brazil to become independent of the Mother Country. For long afterwards British financiers and commercial men exploited the Latin states in South America, and thus increased the wealth and power of Great Britain and European jealousies of her power.

(3) **French Colonies.** France was sore about losing her colonies and not infrequently tried to obtain new ones. Her occupation of Sainte Marie (off Madagascar) in 1821, her conquest of Algiers in the thirties, and her later essays in the Pacific (she almost forestalled Great Britain in occupying New Zealand) illustrated and increased the colonial jealousies which often wrecked the accord of the two "Liberal" Powers in Europe.

(4) **Dutch Colonies.** At the *Peace of Paris* Great Britan restored Java to Holland and paid her £6,000,000 for the Cape of Good Hope and other colonial territories retained; and ten years later the two countries made a friendly arrangement whereby the Dutch exchanged their settlements on the Asiatic mainland for the British settlements in the Spice Islands. But there were long-standing jealousies in S. E. Asia, and new causes of quarrel arose out of the different attitudes of the two countries on the Slave Trade; and these partly account for the action of Great Britain in establishing the independence of Belgium in the thirties, and of Holland in encouraging the discontented Boers in Natal in the forties.

At the *Peace of Paris*, Great Britain retained Malta, Cape Colony, and Mauritius and soon afterwards occupied Ascension—all places on the then road to India; and in 1815 she established a monthly mail service to India with a reduced postal rate of 3/6 per qr. oz. Somewhat later the possibilities of a shorter "overland route" *via* Suez, began to be the subject of discussion and experiment: and this largely accounts for the occupation of Aden in 1839 and for British intervention in the Levant about the same time.

IV. **References.** The ordinary manuals of European History hardly contain even materials for such a meagre sketch as the above on this highly important question. For further information the handiest sources are E. J. Payne, *European Colonies* (the able writer's forecasts, written in 1877, are interesting reading in the changed circumstances of to-day), and C. P. Lucas, *Introduction to the Historical Geography of the British Colonies*. Mr. Payne has in preparation a larger work on the interesting and promising ex-colonial states of South America (C. H. S.). Larger general works are H. C. Morris, *History of Colonisation from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (Macmillan, 2 vols. 15/- net), and Poultney Bigelow, *Children of the Nations* (Heinemann, 10/- net).

I. **Question 31.** *What illustrations does the period* 1814-1848 *afford of the importance of Sea Power in international politics?*

II. **Jottings.** Napoleon at Elba and St. Helena. Canning's policy in South America and Portugal, 1823-5. Growth of Greater Britain. The Barbary pirates. The Greek revolt. French in Algiers, 1830. France and Mehemet Ali, 1839. The Dardanelles, 1822-39.

III. **Answer.** One fact which, though it played so great a part in 1814-1848, yet long escaped the notice of historians is the superiority of Great Britain at sea.

(i) In the Atlantic. British superiority is seen to be undisputed on the Atlantic, and to be at least maintained against weak endeavours in the Mediterranean. When Napoleon was to be put out of Europe, and it had been found that the sovereignty of Elba was at once too small and too large for such a man, the Powers had no choice but to entrust him to Great Britain, the only State which had a prison at once large enough and secure enough, viz., the Atlantic. Britain borrowed St. Helena from her East India Company and kept Napoleon there till his death in 1821. When revolts in Spain and Portugal (1823-5) were causing the Powers to hold Congresses with a view to intervention, and when Canning was "calling the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old," and threatening a "war of opinion" if Portugal were invaded, no one seems to have disputed British power to protect the South American "States," to send fleets to Lisbon harbour, or to land marines in the Portuguese capital.

(ii) In the Pacific. The sea-power of Great Britain—paid for by her maritime commerce—was extended all over the world by means of her navy and the chain of naval stations along the ocean-routes. The growth of Britain's second empire in Australasia and Canada was mainly due to her absolute and almost unchallenged control of the ocean.

(iii) In the Mediterranean. It was otherwise in the Mediterranean. There Great Britain, though then able to hold her own, had to deal with Powers who had interests as well as herself. Italy was, as yet, "a geographical expression," and Spain had ceased to be a Great Power; but Turkey had a fleet; so too had her nominal vassals in Egypt and Barbary; and the island Greeks were of necessity sailors. Not these, however, but France and Russia, were Britain's rivals in the Mediterranean.

(1) Barbary. In 1818, at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, Russia and Prussia proposed to destroy the Barbary pirates; but Great Britain, fearful of seeing Russian ships in the Mediterranean, vetoed the proposal. A few years later, however, the piracy of the Barbary corsairs was ended by the French conquest of Algiers in 1830. Britain was so far jealous of this growth of French power in the Mediterranean that she required promises that the occupation should be merely temporary and should not be extended. These promises, like the similar promises of Great Britain regarding Egypt, have not been kept.

(2) Greece. The Greek revolt (1822-32) illustrates naturally the effect of sea-power. While the Greeks were opposing only Turkey, they had it all their own way, and most of the towns that were besieged could be relieved by sea. It was not till Ibrahim led his adoptive father's fleet to the help of his suzerain that the Greek cause seemed to fall into hopeless ruin. Finally the Battle of Navarino, by destroying the Turko-Egyptian fleet, enabled the diplomatists to settle the struggle in favour of the Greeks.

(3) The Levant. The history of Mehemet Ali, 1832-39, turned on the mutual jealousies among the Powers. France championed the cause of Egypt, but failed against the rest of Europe banded together in the *Quadruple Alliance* of 1840. All the later story of Egypt has further illustrated Brito-French relationships on the revived short route to India.

(4) The Straits. The question of the Dardanelles is important in this connection. They are the strait which opens or closes for Russia the entrance to the Mediterranean. They were made free in 1822 to the vessels of all nations. Turkey's closure of them to Russia in 1827 was one of the causes of war of that time, and by the *Treaty of Adrianople*, Russia forced Turkey to acknowledge her treaty-rights. In 1833, by the *Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi* in which Russia undertook the defence of Turkey, she obtained a promise that the Dardanelles should be closed to the warships of all nations (so as to leave Russia alone able to approach Constantinople by sea); and when Russia was trying in 1839 to win Britain's goodwill, she offered to close also the Bosporus, even to herself. But these were only the early steps in a long quarrel which reached a climax in the Crimean War.

IV. **References.** Incidental remarks are to be found in the ordinary histories of Europe, but the only connected view of this subject (and that but partial) is in J. M. Callwell, *The Effects of Maritime Command on Land Campaigns since Waterloo.* Captain Mahan's works on Sea Power end with 1815, and Mr. W. F. Lord's sketch of the relations of England and France in the Mediterranean ends at 1830. Much illustrative matter will be found in the naval histories of W. L. Clowes (Vol. vi.) and D. Hannay, and in the biographies of Sir Thomas Maitland (by W. F. Lord), Sir Stamford Raffles (by H. E. Egerton), and Lord Dundonald (by J. W. Fortescue).

I. **Question 32.** *Distinguish between "nationalism" and "constitutional government." Why were these not always compatible?*

II. **Jottings:** "Nationalism" defined: often called "liberty." "Constitutional government" defined: often called "liberty." The word "liberty": its ambiguity, its use and abuses. Illustrations of the incompatility of the two ideals: Spain, Italy, Germany, Austria, France reconciles both ideals.

III. **Answer.** (i) Some Definition of the Terms. A *nation* is a people having in common not only a common government (as a *state* which is not a *nation* may have), but also something else such as language, religion, race or history.

(1) **Nationalism** is a belief and a desire that a people which has the other necessary qualifications for a "nation" should, inclusively and exclusively, constitute a State. This extremely complex idea is often summarised in the single word "liberty," which in this sense means freedom from the control of any government that is felt to be "foreign."

(2) **Constitutional Government** may mean any form of goverment which, at any given time or place, is regarded as normal; but in Europe, during the nineteenth century, it has commonly been adopted as a convenient name for any form of government in which an assembly, more or less popularly elected, has a definite and permanent share. This modern and complex idea is also expressed briefly by the single word "liberty," which, in this sense, has an internal not an external significance. "Liberty," indeed, is a word which, as has been wittily said, expresses "whatever in politics we want."

(ii) Some Applications of the Ideas. During the years 1814-1848 "liberty" in both these senses has been an object of desire at various times and in various places; but the two ideals were not always compatible one with another.

(1) **In Spain,** for example, it is abundantly clear that the people as a whole were strong "nationalists": the story of their "revolt" against Napoleon is sufficient to prove that. But it is equally evident that they had little desire and less capacity for "constitutional government." Some few were keen "constitutionalists," and military discontent was apt to express itself in a cry for "the Constitution of 1812"; but for the most part Spaniards were (and are still) strong believers in their Church and its government by priests, strong haters of anything unorthodox, and far more inclined to believe in an Inquisition, however "unenlightened," than in a Cortes set on secular education. The reasons lie deep in the whole course of Spanish history and national education.

(2) **In Italy,** again, the sense of "nationality" was gaining ground on the old provincial sentiment—at any rate, among her leading statesmen; but desire for "constitutional government," though also present, was not so strong as the other. It was only the fact that the kingdom of Sardinia had a Parliament before it coalesced with the rest of Italy that has given Italy to-day both of these *desiderata*.

(3) **In Germany,** the conditions in 1814-48 were most peculiar. The Napoleonic rule and the War of Liberation had combined to create an equal desire for "nationalism," *i.e.*, for the unity of all Germans under one government, and for "constitutional government." But the former was unattainable, except under the control of the ridiculously inefficient and utterly unreformable Diet. Constitutionalism, therefore, had to be "particularist"—*i.e.*, the Germans of each State aimed at making that State "constitutional" without reference to other German States or to Germany as a whole.

(4) **In Austria,** the play of forces was singularly complex. In that Empire there were rival nationalities, German, Magyar, Slav of many kinds. The Imperial Government played off these forces one against the other, specially in the year 1848, and in the end defeated them all without either ideal being attained except in a moderate degree.

(5) **Elsewhere.** Of the other countries of Europe, Russia under Nicholas I. became strongly nationalist and strongly anti-constitutional, whereas Great Britain, while developing its unique system of "constitutional government," failed, and has continued to fail, in producing any sense of nationality for the "United Kingdom" as strong as that which had existed in the sometime kingdom of England. The only European countries, in fact, where nationalism and constitutionalism worked together, were France and Belgium.

IV. **References.** Illustrations and comments will be found in all the histories of Europe and of particular states, Phillips (Introduction) and Seignobos (Conclusion) being especially suggestive. The best cure for the common disease of using political terms rhetorically is to read books and essays by men who are both thinkers and men of affairs: *e.g.*, Seeley, *Introduction to Political Science* (Series I., Lecture V., for "Liberty"); A. Birrell, *Res Judicatae* for "Nationality"; A. V. Dicey, *Law of the Constitution* for "constitutional government." These are all modern: for these ideas as actually conceived in this period, various sayings of Metternich and Wellington may profitably be culled from the manuals, to illustrate one school of thought, and the writings of Cobbett, Lieber, and Mazzini may be read for the other; Sir G. C. Lewis, *Use and Abuse of Political Terms*, aims at scientific impartiality. For literary guidance, see George Brandes, *Main Currents*, and T. S. Omond, *Romantic Triumph*.

L. of C.

Biographical Appendix (1).

This list contains the names of the most notable political personages of the period, and some indication where further information may be found about them. The sources of information mentioned are the answer-pages in this book and certain biographical studies and sketches which are more fully described in the author's "Problems and Exercises in English History, Book G." To these may be added the ordinary biographical dictionaries and encyclopædias. It is more profitable to make a detailed study of persons of first-rate importance (like Canning, Guizot, and Metternich) than to get up compressed biographies of all the lesser notabilities.

Abd-el-Kader (1807-1883): headed resistance to the French in Algeria, 1832-1847.

Aberdeen, George Hamilton Gordon, fourth Earl of (1784-1860): British Ambassador with the Allied Army, 1813-14; Foreign Secretary, 1828-30; Colonial Secretary, 1834-35; Foreign Secretary, 1841-46; Prime Minister, 1852-55. Life by Lord STANMORE (Low, 3/6). Study in P. M. Thornton, "Foreign Secretaries."

Abispal, Henry O'Donnell, Count of (1770-1834): Spanish military officer; revolted in 1819, but betrayed his party; opposed Angoulême in 1823. Q. **7.**

Ali, Pasha of Janina (1744-1822): Albanian chief: always at war with Turkey. Q. **11.**

Angoulême, Louis Antoine de Bourbon, Duke of (1775-1844): eldest son of Charles X.; led French expedition into Spain, 1823; resigned claims on crown when his father abdicated, and died childless.

Arndt, Ernest Maurice (1769-1862). German patriotic poet; author of the song "What is the German Fatherland?"

Artois, Charles Philippe, Count of, King Charles X. of France (1757-1836): third son of Louis XVI.; opposed Napoleon at Lyons, 1815; leader of Clerical party, 1815-24; King of France, 1824-30. Qq. **13, 14.**

Batthyany, Count Louis (1809-49): Revolutionary leader in Hungary, 1848; executed. Q. **23.**

Beauharnais, Eugène de (1781-1824): Napoleon's step-son; Napoleon's viceroy in Italy, 1805-14; his son Auguste was a candidate for the Belgian throne in 1831.

Beresford, William Carr, Viscount and Marshal (1770-1856): generalissimo of Portuguese forces during the Peninsular War; Regent of Portugal, 1815-24. Q. **7.**

Bernadotte, Jean Baptiste Jules (1764-1844): one of Napoleon's marshals; appointed Prince Regent of Sweden; retained his position by deserting Napoleon in 1813; succeeded as Charles XIV., 1818. Qq. **10, 29.**

Bernetorff, Count Christian (1769-1835): Swedish and afterwards Prussian statesman; succeeded Hardenberg as Foreign Minister.

Blanc, Jean Joseph Louis (1811-82): published "Organisation de Travail," 1840; Socialist leader in Paris, 1848; also wrote Histories of France, 1830-40, and of the French Revolution of 1848. Q. **18.**

Blücher, Gebhard Lebrecht von, Prince of Wahlstatt (1742-1819): Prussian general in Waterloo campaign (1815).

Blum, Robert (1807-48): Austrian journalist and revolutionary leader, 1848; member of German Parliament, 1848; executed.

Brandenburg, Frederick William, Count of (1792-1850): appointed Prussian Minister President, November 1848.

Broglie, Achille Charles Léonce Victor, Duke of (1785-1863): defended Ney, 1815; French Foreign Minister 1832-34, and 1834-36.

Canning, George (1770-1827): British Foreign Secretary, 1822-27; Prime Minister, April-August 1827. Lives by F. H. HILL (W. H. Allen, 2/6), and A. G. STAPLETON (Parker, 16/-). Correspondence edited by E. J. STAPLETON. Studies in Hazlitt, "Spirit of the Age," Sir G. C. LEWIS, "Administrations of Great Britain," and P. M. THORNTON, "Foreign Secretaries." Qq. **9-12, 30, 31.**

Canning, Stratford, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe (1786-1880): on many diplomatic missions, specially to Petersburg, 1825-26, and to Constantinople, 1842-58, where he became known as the "Great Eltchi." Life by S. LANE-POOLE (2 vols.).

Capodistrias, John, Count of (1780-1831): Greek: at Congress of Vienna, 1815; Russian Foreign Secretary, 1816-22; President of Greece, 1827-31; assassinated. Qq. **11, 12.**

Carlos, Don (1788-1855); brother of Ferdinand VII. of Spain; conducted war, maintaining his claims against Isabella of Spain 1833-39. Qq. **17, 18.**

Carnot, Lazare Nicolas Marguerite (1753-1823): French statesman; worked for Napoleon, 1814-15; exiled by Louis XVIII.

Castlereagh, Robert Stewart, Viscount, afterwards Marquess of Londonderry (1769-1822): British Foreign Secretary, 1812-22. Life by Sir A. ALISON (Blackwood, 3 vols. *o.p.*). Correspondence edited by his brother, Sir CHARLES STEWART (12 vols.) Study in P. M. Thornton "Foreign Secretaries." Qq. **4, 8, 10.**

Cavaignac, Louis Eugène (1802-57): French General in Morea. In Algeria 1832-48, where he became Governor-general; defeated insurrection in Paris, June 1848; unsuccessful candidate against Louis Napoleon for Presidency of French Republic.

Cavour, Camillo Bensi, Count (1810-1861): established the newspaper, *Il Risorgimento*, 1847; helped to obtain the Sardinian Constitution, 1848; Prime Minister of Sardinia, 1852-1859, 1860-1. Lives by BIANCHI, MASSARA, MAZADE, J. A. R. MARRIOTT, Countess MARTINENGO CESARESCO.

Chlopicki, Joseph (1770-1854): Polish general and Dictator, 1830.

Church, Sir Richard (1785-1873): British general; suppressed banditti in Naples, 1815-20; first as volunteer, and later as generalissimo of Greek forces, did much to secure the independence of Greece; helped to secure the Greek Constitution of 1844. Life by Mrs. E. M. CHURCH. Q. **11.**

Codrington, Sir Edward (1770-1851): British admiral at Navarino, 1827. Life by JOHN BOURCHIER (2 vols.). Q. **12.**

Constantine, Grand Duke (1779-1831): Brother of Alexander I.; Viceroy of Poland; momentary Tsar, 1825. Q. **16.**

Coulaincourt, Armand Augustin Louis de, Duke of Vicenza (1772-1827): Napoleon's ambassador, 1814.

Czartorysky, Prince Adam George (1770-1861): Polish patriot and Russian minister. His "Memoirs and Correspondence with Alexander I.," edited by A. GIELGAD, is one of the chief authorities for the years 1800-25. Q. **27.**

Deák, Francis (1803-76): Hungarian patriot: leader in 1848-49. Wrote memoirs, edited by M. E. GRANT-DUFF (Macmillan, 12/6); anonymous life (by ARNOLD FORSTER). Q. **23.**

Decazes, Elie, Duke of (1780-1860): French Minister of Police, 1815; Chief Minister, 1818-20. Q. **13.**

Dessolles, Jean Joseph Paul Augustin, Marquess (1767-1828): major-general in French National Guard, 1814-15; Foreign Minister, 1819. Q. **13.**

Diebitsch, Count Sabalkansky (1785-1831): Russian general against Turkey, 1829; against Poland, 1831.

Eötvös, Baron Joseph (1813-71): Hungarian patriot: leader in 1848.

Espartero, Baldomero, Duke of Vittoria (1792-1879): Spanish general and Progressista; ousted Christina from the Regency, 1840-43; exiled in England till 1854.

Esterhazy, Prince Paul Anton (1786-1866): succeeded Metternich as Austrian Foreign Minister, 1848.

Fouche, Joseph, Duke of Otranto (1763-1820): served Louis XVIII. and Napoleon till 1816. His Memoirs have been translated into English; study in Brougham's "Statesmen of the Reign of George III." Q. **13.**

Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772-1837): French Socialist writer. Life in F. ARAGO, "Biographies of Distinguished Scientific Men"; see too J. S. MILL, "Political Economy," Bk. II., ch. i. Q. **18.**

Gagern, Heinrich Wilhelm August, Freiherr von (1799-1880): founder of German Burschenschäft; Prime Minister of Hesse-Darmstadt; President of German Parliament, 1848.

Gaj, Ljudevit (1810-72): Croat politician and journalist. Q. **20.**

Gioberti, Vincenzo (1801-52): Italian patriot, priest and theologian; exiled 1833; wrote in 1843 "Primato Morale e Civile degli Italiani" ("Moral and Political Headship of Italy"), looking to Papacy to assume headship of Italy; Sardinian Prime Minister 1848-49; exiled. Q. **20.**

Gregoire, Henry (1750-1831): French Revolutionary leader; chosen to Assembly, 1818. Q. **13.**

Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-1874): French Liberal statesman; held various offices, 1814-20 and 1833-40; French Prime Minister 1840-48; lecturer on Modern History at the Sorbonne. Wrote Memoirs and many works on French and English History (most of which have been translated). Studies by Alison, J. S. Mill, W. N. Senior, etc. Qq. **17, 18.**

Hardenberg, Karl August, Baron, afterwards Prince, von (1750-1822). Prussian State Chancellor. Q. **6.**

Hypsilanti [or Ypsilanti], Prince Alexander (1792-1828): Greek; Russian general; invaded Roumania, 1821; retired into Transylvania; imprisoned. Q. **11.**

Ibrahim Pasha (1789-1841): adopted son of Mehemet Ali, Vali of Egypt; for whom he conducted war in Greece, 1824-27, and in Syria, 1831-1839. Qq. **11, 12, 17.**

Jahn, Frederick Louis (1778-1852): "Turnvater," *i.e.*, founder of Gymnasia in Germany.

Kamptz, Karl Christoph Albert Heinrich von (1769-1849): Prussian politician: Director of Ministry of Police, 1817.

Kanaris, Constantine (1790-1877): Greek sea captain in war of independence.

Klapka, George (1820-1892): Hungarian general in 1848-49; escaped to England and wrote an account of "The War of Independence in Hungary."

Korais, Adamantios (1748-1838): Greek man of letters; inventor of the modern literary Greek language—a compromise between a "classical" Greek and the Romaic. Q. **11.**

Biographical Appendix (2).

Kossuth, Louis (1802-94): Hungarian patriot; commenced journalist, 1841; leader in 1848; escaped to England, where he wrote "Memoirs of My Exile" (Cassell, 10/6). There is a "copious memoir" of him in "Hungary: its History and Revolutions" (Bell, 3/6); and some account in F. W. Newman, "Reminiscences of Two Exiles"; also in *Review of Reviews*, and other such magazines and papers for 1894.

Kotzebue, August Frederick Ferdinand von (1761-1819): dramatist and writer, employed by Alexander of Russia to report on German affairs; murdered by Sand. Qq. **6, 13, 25, 27.**

Lafayette, Marie Jean Paul Roch Yves Gilbert Mohir, Marquess of (1757-1834): took part in the American Revolution, and the French Revolutions of 1789 and 1830. Memoirs edited by M. P. D. de Noailles (translated); life by Bayard Tuckermann (Low, 2 vols., 12/-); study in Brougham, "Statesmen of George III.'s Reign," and in Edith Sichel, "Household of the Lafayettes" (Constable, 6/-). Q. **14.**

Laffitte, Jacques (1768-1844): Governor of the Bank of France; took a leading part in the Revolution of July; French Finance Minister, 1830. Q. **14.**

Lamartine, Alphonse (1792-1869): opposed Guizot; leading member of the French Provisional Government, 1848; wrote various brilliant but misleading sketches of French History (all translated in Bohn's Standard Library, 8 vols. each 3/6). Study in Alison's Essays, vol. II.

Latour, General Count Theodore (1780-1848): Austrian Minister of War, 1848; murdered.

Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste (1807-74): wrote "Appel aux Travailleurs," 1846, in favour of universal suffrage; French revolutionary leader, 1848.

Louis, Louis Dominique, Baron (1755-1837): as French Finance Minister, 1815, 1818, 1831-32, did much to establish the Bourbon Restoration and the Orleanist Monarchy respectively.

Maassen, Karl Georg (1769-1834): Prussian Finance Minister; founder of the Zollverein.

Manin, Daniele (1804-57): Venetian revolutionary leader, 1848.

Martignac, Jean Baptiste Silvère Gaye, Viscount of (1776-1832): with Angoulême in Spain, 1823; became viscount, 1824; moderate Liberal; Minister, 1828-30. Qq. **13, 14.**

Mazzini, Giuseppe (1805?-1872): born at Genoa; Italian patriot; expelled, 1831: formed the party of "Young Italy"; expelled from Marseilles, 1832-33; went first to Switzerland, then to London, 1836: in Italy, 1848-49. Selections from his "Life and Writings" (6 vols.) are contained in a volume of the Scott Library (1/6), there are also studies in A. R. Marriott, "Makers of Modern Italy" (Macmillan, 2/6) and Countess Martinengo Cesaresco, "Italian Characters in the Age of Unification." Q. **20.**

Mehemet Ali (1769-1849): Viceroy of Egypt, 1809-44; sent troops to help Sultan in the Greek war of independence; warred in Syria, 1831-39. Qq. **11, 12, 17, 31.**

Melbourne, William Lamb, Viscount (1779-1848): British Home Secretary, 1830-34: Premier (with short break) 1834-41. Life by H. Dunckley (Low, 3/6), and W. M. T. Torrens (Ward, Lock, 3/6); papers edited by L. C. Sanders; study in A. Hayward's "Eminent Statesmen."

Metternich, Clement Wenceslas Lothaire, Count, afterwards Prince (1773-1859): Austrian State Chancellor, 1809-48. Life by G. B. Malleson (W. H. Allen, 2/6); much better (in French) by Charles de Mazade. His Memoirs, extending to 1835, have been translated by Mrs. A. Napier and B. W. Smith (5 vols.). Study in A. Hayward's "Eminent Statesmen." Qq. **3-11, 21.**

Miguel, Dom Maria Evarist (1802-66): brother of John IV. King of Portugal; headed the Clerical party in the civil war of 1828-34. Qq. **17, 18.**

Mole, Count Louis Mathieu de (1780-1855): French Foreign Minister 1830-31; Prime Minister, 1836-39.

Monroe, James (1758-1831): Fifth President of the United States of America, 1817-1825, during the "Era of Good Feeling"; author of the Message of 2 December, 1823, protesting against European intervention in America. Qq. **9, 30.**

Montmorency, Matthieu Jean Félicité de Montmorency-Laval, Viscount, afterwards Duke of (1766-1826): French Foreign Minister, 1822.

Murat, Joachim, Grand Duke of Berg, King of Naples (1767 or 1771 to 1815): King of Naples 1808-15; shot, October 1815. Q. **27.**

Napoleon Bonaparte (1769-1821): Corsican by birth; First Consul, 1799-1804; Emperor of the French, 1804-14, 1815; fought Waterloo campaign, 1815; exiled to St. Helena. The best short lives in English are by J. R. Seeley (Seeley, 6/-), and W. O'Connor Morris (Putnam, 5/-): there are longer lives by W. C. Hazlitt, Sir Walter Scott, W. M. Sloane, and J. H. Rose; also studies by Alison, Jeffrey, and Emerson. There are accounts of the Waterloo campaign by Chesney, Gardner, Houssaye, O'Connor, Morris, J. C. Ropes, Siborne, etc. His life at St. Helena is the subject of many books, *e.g.*, Lord Rosebery, "Napoleon: The Last Phase" (Humphreys, 7s 6d. net). Qq. **1, 2, 31.**

Napoleon Bonaparte, Charles Louis (1808-73): son of Napoleon's brother Louis; with Carbonari in Italy, 1831; attempt at Strassburg, 1836; attempt at Boulogne, 1840; in prison at Ham, 1840-46; President of the French Republic, 1848; Emperor of the French, 1852-70. Life by Blanchard Jerrold; see too Victor Hugo "History of a Crime."

Nesselrode, Carl Robert, Count of (1780-1862): Russian Chancellor, 1810-1855.

Ney, Michel, Duke of Elchingen, Prince of the Moskawa (1769-1815): deserted to Napoleon 1815; executed by Louis XVIII. Q. **2.**

Palmella, Dom Pedro de Sousa-Holstein, Duke of (1781-1850); at Vienna, 1814; often in office as Liberal Minister under Maria, Queen of Portugal

Palmerston, Henry John Temple, Viscount (1784-1866): British Secretary at War, 1809-28; Foreign Secretary, 1830-41, 1846-1851. Lives by L. C. Sanders (W. H. Allen, 2/6), Marquess of Lorne (Low, 3/6), E. Ashley (2 vols. *o.p.*); studies in Walter Bagehot, "Biographical Studies," and P. M. Thornton "Foreign Secretaries." Qq. **17-20.**

Peel, Sir Robert (1788-1850): Secretary for Ireland, 1812-18; Home Secretary, 1822-27, 1828-1830: Premier, 1834-35, 1839, 1841-46. Short lives by J. R. Thursfield (Macmillan, 2/6); F. C. Montague (W. H. Allen, 2/6); Justin McCarthy (Low, 3/6); longer biographies by Lord Dalling and Bulwer, Guizot, and C. S. Parker (3 vols the standard life); also studies by Bagehot, Brougham, and Ewald.

Pepe, Guglielmo (1783-1855): Revolutionary leader in Naples 1820-21 and 1848-49. His own accounts of these movements have not been trans lated into English. Q. **7.**

Perier, Casimir (1777-1832): French banker and Revolutionary leader, 1830; Minister, 1831-32. Q. **18.**

Polignac, Armand Jules Marie Heraclius, Count, afterwards Duke of (1771-1847): French Ambassador in Great Britain, 1823-29; French Prime Minister, April-July 1830. Qq. **13, 14.**

Radetzky, Joseph Wenzel (1766-1858): Austrian General, afterwards Governor-General in Italy, 1831-50. Qq. **21, 22.**

Radziwill, Michael (1778-1850): Polish general, 1830.

Reshid Pasha (1802-1858): Turkish Ambassador in London: as chief Minister to Abdul-Medjid II., attempted to introduce reforms in finance and administration, and supported British influence.

Richelieu, Armand Emmanuel Sophie Septimanie du Plessis, Duke of (1766-1822): French Minister, 1815-18 and 1820-21.

Riego, Rafael del (1785-1823): Spanish Revolutionary officer, 1822-23; executed.

Saint Simon, Claude Henri, Count of (1760-1825): French socia philosopher.

Schwarzenberg, Prince Felix (1800-52): Austrian Minister, 1848-52.

Sebastiani, Horace François, Count (1776-1851): French Foreign minister, 1830-35.

Soult, Nicolas Jean de Dieu (1769-1851): French War Minister, 1814; Joined Napoleon, 1815; War Minister, 1830-47; Chief Minister, 1839-40. Q. 1.

Stein, Henry Frederick Charles, Freiherr vom (1757-1831): reorganised Prussia after Jena; exile in Russia; stirred up German national sentiment against Napoleon. Best book on him is Sir J. R. Seeley, "Life and Time of Stein" (Camb. Press, 3 vols., 36/-). Q. **2.**

Szechenyi, Stephen, Count of (1792- ?): Hungarian noble and patriot, 1831-48; opposed to Kossuth's extremer ideas; went mad, 1848.

Talleyrand-Perigord, Charles Maurice de, Bishop of Autun, Prince of Benevento (1754-1838): President of French Provisional Government, 1814-15; at Congress of Vienna, 1814-15; revolutionary leader, 1830; Ambassador to Great Britain, 1831-37. His "Correspondence with Louis XVI'I. during the Congress of Vienna" has been translated into English by M. G. Pallain (2 vols.); his Memoirs, edited by the Duc de Broglie, have been translated by R. Ledos de Beaufort and Mrs. A. Hall, (3 vols.). There are studies by Brougham and by Lord Dalling and Bulwer. Qq. **1, 2, 15.**

Thiers, Louis Adolphe (1707-1877): French journalist, who was a chief wirepuller in the Revolution of July 1830; minister of the Interior, 1832, afterwards Foreign minister; in opposition, 1836-40; 1840 Foreign Minister for six months); opposed the Revolution of 1848; afterwards President of the Third Republic; wrote long histories of the first French Revolution and of France under the Consulate and Empire. There is a short life of him as a writer by A. de Remusat; also political studies by A. Hayward and W. N. Senior. Q. **18.**

Villele, Jean Baptiste Seraphin Joseph, Count de (1773-1854): French minister 1821-28. Q. **14.**

Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of (1769-1852): British General in India and the Peninsula; at Congress of Vienna, 1815; in the Waterloo campaign, 1815; ambassador at Aix-la-Chapelle, 1818, at Verona, 1822, in Russia, 1826; Premier, 1828-30, and November-December, 1834: Foreign Minister, 1835-6: in the Cabinet, 1841-46. There are short lives by G. Hooper (Macmillan, 2/6), G. R. Gleig (Longmans, 3/6), and R. Waite (Longmans, 3/6); longer lives by C. D. Yonge, Sir Herbert Maxwell, and Arthur Griffiths; also military studies by O'Connor Morris, and F. Maurice. Qq. **1, 2, 12.**

Windischgrätz, Alfred, Prince (1787-1862): Austrian General in Bohemia and Vienna, 1848. Qp, **21, 23.**

Zumala-Carreguy, Thomas (1789-1835): Basque leader against Napoleon; most successful of the Carlist generals, 1833-1835.

Additional Questions.*

A.—For First Reading: Chronological.

33. What were the main questions raised at the Congress of Vienna? Explain the attitude assumed by the chief Powers at the Congress, and give a summary of its results.

34. Explain how serious dissensions arose in the Congress of Vienna.

35. Is it true that in the Congress of Vienna the interests of dynasties were treated with more consideration than the wishes of peoples?

36. What attention was paid to the principle of nationality in (*a*) the Congress of Vienna, (*b*) the *Second Treaty of Paris*?

37. Describe the objects and chief actions of the *Holy Alliance*.

38. What were the real and what were the avowed motives of the *Holy Alliance*?

39. Compare the aims and progress of Liberal ideas in France and Spain between 1818 and 1825.

40. Who were the chief native patriots and who the most distinguished Philhellenes in the Greek War of Independence? Summarise events to the Proclamation of the Monarchy.

41. Explain how some European Powers differed in views but acted in concert with regard to Greek Independence.

42. Show how the relations among the Great Powers of Europe compelled some of them to back up the Greeks in their efforts to gain independence.

43. Sketch the course of events which led to the *Treaty of Adrianople*. Why did not Russia get more by that treaty?

44. "Charles X. of France contrasts with Lewis XVIII. as James II. of England with Charles II." Draw out the contrast with regard to the two kings of France.

45. Account for the failure to maintain the union between Holland and Belgium established by the Congress of Vienna.

46. How did Belgium become an independent State?

47. Give some account of the opinions, character, and influence of the first King of the Belgians.

48. Sketch the effects upon (*a*) Russia, (*b*) Germany, of the French Revolution of 1830.

49. What was the political condition of the Poles immediately after the Congress of Vienna, and how was it subsequently modified?

50. "The *Quadruple Alliance* was an answer to the Conference of Münchengrätz." Explain this.

51. How did absolute monarchy become impossible for Spain after the death of Ferdinand VII.?

52. What noteworthy ministers served under Louis Philippe? Review rapidly the reign.

53. Examine the chief elements of strength and weakness in the government of Louis Philippe and the causes of its ultimate downfall.

54. Trace the growth of discontent against the Orleanist Government in France from 1837 to 1848.

55. What were the elements making for union in Germany about 1840?

B.—For Revision: Topical.

56. Sketch the career of Bernadotte as a soldier of fortune and as statesman and sovereign.

57. What influences shaped the character in youth of the Emperor Alexander I.? Who towards the close of his career were his most intimate and confidential advisers? Attempt a short general appreciation of his place in the history of Russia and of Europe.

58. What were the circumstances of the accession of the Emperor Nicholas I. to the Russian throne? What early triumphs of the reign in Asia are marked by the *Peace of Turkmanchai*?

59. Contrast the influence of Metternich and Canning on European affairs.

60. Trace the career of Prince Louis Napoleon down to the time when he was elected President of the French Republic. What, at that date, was the current estimate of his character and capacities?

61. Give some account of the rise and importance of Mehemet Ali.

62. How did the ambitious policy of Mehemet Ali lead to disputes among the European Powers, and how were those disputes ended?

63. What led to the French Expedition of 1830 against Algiers? Follow the history of conquest and colonisation in Algiers down to the end of the reign of Louis Philippe.

64. Compare the revolution of July with that of February in regard to their causes and their results.

65. Trace the influence of nationalist feeling on the movements of 1830 and 1848 outside France.

66. About 1815 the Ottoman Empire had been declared to be moribund. What causes helped it to a fresh lease of life?

67. How far was the principle of nationality concerned (*a*) in the formation of the kingdoms of Greece and of Belgium, and (*b*) in the extension of Switzerland?

68. What is the importance in the history of Switzerland of the last decade of your period?

69. How far may the formation and the dissolution of the Sonderbund be regarded as events of European importance? Can you cite any modern parallels?

70. How do you explain the decline in the eighteenth century of the Imperial dignity and ideal, and the renewal and popularity of Imperialism in the nineteenth century?

71. Note the chief landmarks in the relations between Hungary and the House of Hapsburg from the death of Joseph II. to the end of your period.

72. Estimate the extent of Austrian influence in Italy after 1815, and trace the rise of the opposition to it up to 1848.

73. Account for the growth of Italian patriotism and illustrate its influence in the later part of your period.

74. What progress was made between 1815 and 1848 in the movement towards the unification of Italy?

75. What were the general features of the Socialist movement in Europe during the first half of the nineteenth century?

76. What events in Europe facilitated the establishment of independent states in Central and Southern America?

77. In what wars did the United States of America engage between the years 1800 and 1848? What were the provocations in each case, and the results?

* *Extracted from various Government Examination Papers, by permission of the Controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office.*

A BRIEF VOCABULARY OF POLITICAL TERMS.

NOTE.—These political terms, some general, some particular, occur in most accounts of European History, 1814-1848. They are not always as simple as they look; and the student will do well to make sure that he knows the meaning of each, and can distinguish between "synonyms." Terms in foreign languages are shown in *italics*.

Abdication
Abolitionist
Absolute
Absolutist
Act
Administration
Agitation
Agrarian
Alliance
Ambassador
Ancien Régime
Anglican
Annexation
Arbitrary
Aristocracy
Army
Articles
Assembly
Association
Balance of Power
Barricades
Barrier
Benthamism
Bishop
Blockade
Bourgeois
Bourgeois King
Bribery
Brigand
Bundesstaat
Burschenschaft
Cabinet
Canton
Carbonari
Cardinal
Carlist
Catholic
Centre
Chamber
Chambre Introuvable
Chancellor
Charter
Chartism
Church
Citizen King
Civil
Civilisation
Clergy
Coalition
Code
Colony
Combination
Commerce
Commission
Committee
Communism
Compact
Concert of Europe
Concession
Confederate
Confederation
Conference
Congregation
Congress
Conscience
Conscript
Conspiracy
Constituent
Constitution
Constitutional
Continental System
Convention
Corn Law
Corruption
Corsair
Cortes
Cossack
Count
Coup d'Etat
Court
Criminal
Customs Union
Czar
Debate
Declaration
Decree
Delegate
Democracy
Denunciation
Deputy
Despotic
Diet
Diplomacy
Dismemberment
Dissenter
Dissident
Divine Right
Doctrinaire
Duke
Dynasty
Eastern Question
Elective
Emancipation
Emigrant
Emigré
Emperor
Empire
Equality before the Law
Establishment
Excommunication
Executive Commission
Expansion
Federal
Final Act
Finance
Fourierism
Four Powers
Franchise
Fraternity
Free
Freedom
Free Trade
Fundamental
Gallican
German Parliament
Government
Grand Army
Grand Duke
Guerilla
Hereditary
Hetairia
Hierarchy
Holy Alliance
Holy Office
Holy Places
Holy Roman Empire
Hundred Days
Hundred Years
Ideology
Illyrism
Imperial
Independence
Industrial
Infidel
Inquisition
Insurrection
Interim
International
Intervention
Invasion
Islam
Jacobin
Janissary
Jesuit
July Monarchy
Jury
Kaiserlich
Khalif
King
Kingdom
Klepht
Koran
Laity
Landwehr
Language
Law
Law, Civil
Lay
Left
Legislation
Legitimacy
Legitimist
Liberal
Liberation
Liberty
Machinery
Magyar
Manchester School
Manhood Suffrage
March Laws
Mediation
Mediatisation
Middle Classes
Minister
Ministerial Responsibility
Missionary
Monroe Doctrine
Monsieur
Moslem
Mussalmán
Napoleonic Legend
Nation
National
,, Assembly
,, Guard
,, Workshops
Nationality
Navy
Negro
Nobles
Non-Intervention
Note Secrète
Obscurantism
Occupation
Old *Régime*
Oppression
Orders
Order in Council
Ordinance
Orthodox
Padishah
Panslavist
Papacy
Papal
Parliament
Parliamentarian
Parliamentary
Particularism
Partisan
Party
Pasha
Patriarch
Patriotism
Pavillon Marsan
Peace
Peasant Proprietor
Peer
People
Persecution
Pirate
Plébiscite
Plenipotentiary
Police
Political
Pope
Popish
Porte
Pragmatic Sanction
Premier
Prerogative
President
Press
Prime Minister
Prince
Privileges
Prohibition
Proletariat
Propaganda
Property Qualification
Prosecution
Protection
Protestant
Provisional Govt.
Punctation
Quadrilateral
Quadruple
Race
Rebellion
Reconstruction
Red Republican
Reform
Regent
Religion
Representative
Repression
Republic
Restoration
Revolt
Revolution
Right
Rights
Romanticism
Royalist
Scrutin de Liste
Secretary
Self-Government
Senate
Serfdom
Sick Man
Slavery
Slave Trade
Socialism
Soldier
Sovereign
Sovereignty
Spanish Marriages
Staatenbund
State
Subject
Suffrage
Sultan
Suppression
Tariff
Taxation
Third Estate
Three Days
Tiers Etat
Toleration
Tractarian
Treaty
Tribune
Tribute
Triple
Triune Kingdom
Tsar
Tugendbund
Turnvater
Twelve Points
Tyrant
Ultra
Ultramontanism
Unconstitutional
Union, Complete
,, Personal
,, Real
United States
Utilitarianism
Veto
Viceroy
Vor-Parlament
White Terror
Young Czech
,, Italy
Zollverein

IMPORTANT NEW EDUCATIONAL SERIES IN PROCESS OF PUBLICATION.

Eight volumes, quarto (10¼ x 8in.), each containing 80—100 pp.

Price 2/- or 3/- nett each. Special Subscription Terms for the Series.

Problems and Exercises in English History

BY

J. S. LINDSEY.

OBJECTS OF THE SERIES.

To show Students and Teachers of History		Each Book contains
What Books to Read - - - - -	*10-15 pp.*	*Select Classified Bibliographies.*
What Subjects to Study - - - -	*60-80*	*Typical Questions.*
	300	*Notable Topics.*
How to use the knowledge gained by reading	*60-80*	*Complete Answers* with *Hints and References.*

The Complete Series of Eight Books contain (besides other useful matter):

40 pages of Practical Bibliographies—described by the *Athenæum* as "sound."
16 ,, Typical Questions (available in separate form as Test Papers).
500 ,, Specimen Answers—characterised by the *Bookman* as "sensible."

PLAN OF THE SERIES.

		NETT PRICES. *Ordinary.*	*Interleaved.*
X Set (following the period divisions adopted by the Oxford Local Delegacy).			
College of Preceptors, Class II, III. A.	1066-1399 *(March, 1902).* Oxford Local, July, 1902; College of Preceptors, Senior, 1901, 1902; London Intermediate Arts (Honours), 1902.	2/-	3/-
B.	1399-1603 *(Ready).* College of Preceptors, Senior, 1901, 1902; Cambridge Higher Local, June, 1902.	2/-	3/-
C.	1603-1715 *(March, 1902).* Oxford Local, July, 1902; London Intermediate Arts (Honours), July, 1903.	2/-	3/-
D.	1715-1820 *(January, 1902).* College of Preceptors, 1901, 1902; London Intermediate (Pass), July, 1902; Irish Intermediate, Preparatory Grade, June, 1902.	2/-	3/-
Y Set (following the period divisions adopted by the Cambridge Local Syndicate).			
E.	449-1509 *(In preparation).*		
F.	1509-1688 *(In preparation).* Irish Intermediate, Senior Grade, 1902; London Intermediate Arts (Pass), 1902.	2/-	3/-
G.	1688-1832 *(November, 1901).* Cambridge Local, December, 1901; Oxford and Cambridge Joint Board, July, 1902; Irish Intermediate, Preparatory and Middle Grades, June, 1902; Cambridge General, 1901, 1902.	2/-	3/-
H.	B.C. ?-1900 *(December, 1901).* Scottish Leaving Certificate; King's Scholarship; Oxford Second Public Examination (Pass), Group B.	3/-	4/-
	This Book contains 80 Questions and Answers (half before and half after 1603) dealing with the Essentials *of British History.*		
	Total Cost, *nett* .	17/-	25/-
	Special Subscription Terms (till 31 March, 1902), *post free* .	15/-	22/6

SPECIAL VOLUMES IN ACTIVE PREPARATION.

Matriculation Note-Book of English History (to 1700): adapted from Book H. . . 2/- 3/-

Certificate Note-Book of European History, 1814-1848: for English Teachers' Certificate Examination, July, 1902. Containing Introductory Sketch, Chronological Synopsis, Select Bibliography, Glossary, Short Biographies, Topics, and 32 Specimen Answers. 2/- 3/-

CAMBRIDGE: HEFFER AND SONS

AND OF ALL BOOKSELLERS

THE TWO UNIONS: CIRCUMSTANCES.

Extracts from "Suggestions for Use" [one page common to all the Books].—*Read up subject and make jottings; compare jottings with those here given; work out answer and compare that given in these books; look up discrepancies in statements or expressions.*

Each volume contains sixty or eighty pages similar in style to this but varied in treatment: they are meant to help alike teachers and learners, examiners and examinees.

I. *Question 983. Indicate the chief differences in the circumstances under which the Scottish and the Irish Unions were effected.*

II. ***Jottings.*** Circumstances either "immediate" or "ultimate." "Immediate" circumstances include recent instances of friction (ecclesiastical or commercial), or attempts at separation; the methods adopted to effect the Unions; also pressure of international complications and need of unity. "Ultimate" circumstances include the length and nature of the constitutional connexion between the uniting kingdoms and their general condition—political, economic, and social.

Immediate circumstances. (i) 1707: England makes concessions to avoid separation, rendered probable by irritation over Darien failure. (ii) 1800: Ireland punished for attempt at separation, '98.

Ultimate circumstances: Anglo-Scottish Union satisfactory: Brito-Irish unsatisfactory. Why?

III. *Answer.* The circumstances under which the Legislative Unions of 1707 and 1801 were effected fall naturally into two groups: the *immediate* circumstances which *occasioned*, and the *ultimate* or remoter circumstances which *conditioned*, the two unions.

(i) Immediate Circumstances. Both Unions took place during the course of great foreign wars, mainly against France, and were primarily designed to increase the unity and strength, offensive and defensive, of the British Isles, regarded as an international Power. But these resemblances only mask deeper differences. The Anglo-Scottish Union took place after the Scots had made a serious threat to sever the personal union; and Queen Anne's advisers thought it worth while for England to *persuade*, rather than try to *compel*, the Scots to desist from this attempt. This Union, therefore, was the result of bargaining between two kingdoms meeting on equal terms, in which the stronger southern kingdom deemed it expedient to give way on all the more important points at issue. The Brito-Irish Union took place after the suppression of an armed attempt by a considerable party in Ireland to break loose from Great Britain, with the aid of the foreign enemies of the latter Power. Naturally, therefore, the latter Union differed from the former in being a punishment and a restraint, rather than a bribe or a bargain.

The documents embodying the Unions bear witness to this "chief difference" between them: in the Anglo-Scottish Union, the term "treaty" is very prominent, and the whole tone is that of two independent kingdoms meeting on equal terms; while in the Brito-Irish Union the term "treaty" is much less prominent than the term "imperial," and the general tone is that of the compulsory swallowing up of the smaller kingdom by the larger. The opponents of both Unions loudly accused the Government at Westminster of carrying their measures by corrupt means, but these charges have been much more persistent in the case of the later Union. This difference, however, between the circumstances of the two Unions—if it really exists—can readily be explained by the great development of the art of parliamentary "management" during the eighteenth century.

(ii) Ultimate Circumstances. In the deeper and more remote circumstances which affected the two Unions, the chief differences appear to fall into three main groups:

(1) **National Unity.** The kingdoms of England and Scotland had each attained a very considerable degree of unity before they came together in personal union (1603), but Ireland began to be affected (and still further divided) by English influence before it had independently attained national unity.

(2) **Length of Connexion.** Ireland had been coming piecemeal under English *control* ever since the reign of Henry II: Scotland, though often under English influence and occasionally under English control, had not come into enduring political partnership with England till 1603, and had then joined England (*a*) as a whole, (*b*) on equal terms.

(3) **Church.** England and Scotland, though divided in church-government, had first come together through, and found their closest tie in, a common Protestantism. Ireland was both divided against itself and separated from Great Britain by the adherence of the majority of its inhabitants to Roman Catholicism.

It is mainly owing to the great differences in the circumstances of the two Unions in these three respects that the earlier Union has been on the whole satisfactory in its results, while the later Union has not proved satisfactory to anybody. To these differences some might add differences in "Race," but it is doubtful whether marked racial differences can be traced in the British Isles, or can be made to correspond with their historic divisions.

IV. ***References.*** For the terms see G. C. Lee, §§194, 208: for the circumstances see any good history, especially Lecky (first and last volumes), R. S. Rait, "The Scottish Parliament"; J. T. Ball, "Historical Review of Legislative Systems Operative in Ireland, 1171-1800."

Problems and Exercises in History

By J. S. LINDSEY.

SCHEME OF THE BRITISH SERIES.

X SET—English History.

A. 1066-1399. Ready, March, 1902.
B. 1399-1603. *Published, June*, 1901.
C. 1603-1715. Ready, March, 1902.
D. 1715-1820. Ready, January, 1902.

N.B.—This arrangement is adapted to the period divisions at present adopted by the Oxford Local Delegates, the College of Preceptors, and the Board of Education.

Y SET—English History.

E. 449-1509. *In preparation.*
F. 1509-1688. *In preparation.*
G. 1688-1832. **Ready, November, 1901.**
H. B.C. ?-1900. Ready, December, 1901.

N.B.—This arrangement is adapted to the period divisions at present adopted by the Cambridge Local Syndicate, and the Oxford and Cambridge Joint Board.

ORDER FORM.

To Messrs.....
Booksellers,
.....

or

To W. Heffer and Sons,
4, Petty Cury,
Cambridge.

Herewith I enclose cheque, postal order, for £ s. d. in payment of:—

i. **Subscription** for the whole series, as described above.

For Eight Books, **A-H** (ordinary edition) 15 0
" " " (interleaved edition) 22 6
For *Seven* Books (excluding B or G, which I have), ordinary . . . 13 0
" " " " interleaved . . 20 0

If, owing to any circumstances, of which the publishers shall be the judge, it is impossible to complete the series, the return of the balance left in their hands, after charging pro rata *for any book or books which may have been delivered, shall cancel all obligation on the part of the publishers or of their agents.*

ii. **Single Book** only [Postage, 3d. for ordinary edition, 4d. for interleaved edition].

.....copies of Book.....ordinary, 2/- each; interleaved, 3/- each . .....

.....copies of Book **H**, ordinary, 3/- each; interleaved, 4/- each . .....

iii. **Leaflets.**

		Dozen.	Single Copies.	
Self-Testing Apparatus contained in Book..... [Two pages of Questions; Topics; Formulae (Hints in B). Printed on one side of the paper only.]	4pp.	2/-	6d.	.....
Practical Bibliographies:				
No. (1) Teaching and Study of History . . . (Together with Hints on Answering History Questions).	4pp.	1/-	3d.	.....
No. (2) General British History	4pp.	1/-	3d.	.....
No. (6) Special Period: 1399-1603	4pp.	1/-	3d.	.....
No. (9) " 1688-1783	4pp.	1/-	3d.	.....
No. (10) " 1783-1815	4pp.	1/-	3d.	.....
No. (11) " 1815-1837	4pp.	1/-	3d.	.....
			Total . .	

Name M .....

Address.....

Please cross out the lines or words not required.

LINDSEY'S PROBLEMS & EXERCISES IN ENGLISH HISTORY.

Opinions of the Press on Book "B" (1399-1603).

The only unfavourable notice received during the first three months after publication (on 28 June, 1901) has been inserted below in distinctive type.

Arbroath Herald, *15th August*, 1901.—The questions are fully representative of the period and are answered splendidly. Tabulated answers, variety of type, and other means serve to make this a very helpful book for revisal purposes . . . All teachers should see it.

Bedfordshire Times and Independent, *9th August*, 1901.—Very useful in practical school work.

Athenæum, *21st September*, 1901.—A most valuable piece of apparatus in the hands of a skilful teacher or conscientious self-educator . . . . In the introduction, excellent hints are given as to method in answering questions, together with ten pages of sound bibliography . . . . As to the questions, we have tested them over a period with which we are thoroughly familiar, and find them, though not exhaustive, representative of the main currents, some being in the nature of book-work and others of riders. We welcome a series so well planned, and, in this first book at any rate, well executed. All through, the experience of the teacher and examiner is in evidence.

Bookman, *August*, 1901.—An incentive to thought.

Bookseller, *August*, 1901.—Mr. Lindsey may be congratulated on the thorough way in which he has done his work.

Belfast News Letter, *11th July*, 1901.—The answers are models of accuracy and neatness, and the student who can approach them without referring to his books or notes will obtain high marks at his examination.

Birmingham Gazette, *4th July*, 1901.—We strongly recommend it.

Daily News, *26th July*, 1901.—A very full bibliography of generally available books is given, and test papers are set and answered. These should prove valuable to examinees, as showing what examiners want, and their general plan will recommend them to all students who want to be guided in their course of reading.

County Council Times, *10th August*, 1901.—Mr. Lindsey . . . has made a notable achievement as a pioneer in educational methods.

Echo, *17th July*, 1901.—The student who is working for an examination will find the book of very great value and, indeed, indispensable; since it not only supplies him with information, but teaches him by example how to present his knowledge . . . . The series . . . . will materially aid in the intelligent study of English History.

Educational News, *13th July*, 1901.—The book will prove of the utmost service to teachers and lecturers in history.

Guardian, *11th September*, 1901.—The compiler's idea is a novel one, and presents features that may be useful to the busy schoolmaster, particularly when the inevitable examinations are approaching, and he wishes to test the results of his teaching from a standpoint other than his own.

Glasgow Herald, *6th July*, 1901.—Mr. Lindsey has made a careful study of his authorities.

Literary World, *27th September*, 1901.—The author has done his work conscientiously and very satisfactorily. The questions are of high merit, the hints are practical, and the answers exhibit much research and notable accuracy.

Notes and Queries, *3rd August*, 1901. **—A mere cram book.**

School World, *August*, 1901.—A book for the practical teacher's library.

Reading Mercury, *13th July*, 1901.—Intended to benefit the teacher as well as the pupil, with bibliographies for the one and model answers for the other. The test papers should be useful to boys and girls on the eve of an examination.

Teachers' Aid, *21st September*, 1901.—We cannot too strongly recommend the book to students of history. The questions have been answered in a scholarly manner, and the answers convey much information concerning various topics which cannot be met with in the ordinary run of text-books. The style of the answers, too, will materially assist the learner to reason out certain consequences and inferences for himself, and thus the ability to set out his knowledge in both logical and orderly sequence will be gradually acquired.

Spectator, *3rd August*, 1901.—A useful contribution to the great present-day art of examining and being examined.

Westminster Review, *September*, 1901.—A remarkable example of industry and scholarship.

Weekly Register, *6th September*, 1901.—Whether as an educational adjunct, or as a historical monograph, or as an exhibition of skill and patient labour, it deserves to be very carefully weighed, both by teachers and learners . . . . We are attracted by the writer's general honesty.

W. HEFFER AND SONS, PUBLISHERS, CAMBRIDGE.

ENGLISH HISTORY, 1688—1832.

BOOK "G."

Synopsis of Contents.

Pages.	Left-Hand Pages.	Pages.	Right-Hand Pages.
iii, iv	Preface and Practical Suggestions.	v-vii	Reference Summary of the Period.
viii	Chronological Synopsis of Events.	1	*Hints on Answering History Questions.
2	Teaching History: Method Questions.	3	Bibliography: Teaching of History.
4	Bibliography: Study of History.	5-8	Bibliography: General British History.
9, 10	Bibliography: Special, 1688-1714.	11-13	Bibliography: Special, 1714-1783.
14-16	Bibliography: Special, 1783-1815.	17-19	Bibliography: Special, 1815-1837.
20	*Notable Topics (300), 1688-1832.	21	*Formulae in History Questions.
22	*Thirty "Junior" Questions: 6 Papers.	23	*Thirty "Senior" Questions: 6 Papers.

Pg.	Q.	I. 1688—1714. ("Junior.")	Pg.	Q.	I. 1688—1714. ("Senior.")
24	702	War in Ireland, 1689-1691.	25	707	Constitutional Changes, 1688.
26	708	New Standing Army.	27	713	Act of Settlement and Bill of Rights.
28	718	Anglo-Scottish Union: Causes, Terms.	29	719	Scotland, 1688-1707.
30	724	Spanish Succession War: Causes, etc.	31	725	Peace of Utrecht: Arguments.
32	728	Ten Names: Persons and Places.	33	729	Jealousy of Foreigners.
		II. 1714—1763.			II. 1714—1763.
34	740	George I's Title.	35	739	Hanoverian Foreign Policy.
36	746	Walpole: Career and Ministry.	37	741	Whigs under First Two Georges.
38	752	Septennial Act: Calendar.	39	751	Protestant Nonconformists.
40	754	Charles Edward's Movements, 1745-6.	41	753	Six Acts of Parliament.
42	766	Seven Years' War: Causes, etc.	43	767	Austria and George II.
		III. 1760—1783.			III. 1760—1783.
44	774	"George, be a King!"	45	775	George and Ministers, 1780-1784.
46	786	America *v.* Great Britain.	47	787	Seven Years' War & Amer. Revolution.
48	788	Treaties of 1763 and 1783.	49	789	Command of the Sea, 1760-1783.
50	792	Irish Autonomy, 1782.	51	793	Ireland, 1760-1782.
52	798	Five Episodes: Importance.	53	955	Clive and Warren Hastings.
		IV. 1783—1815.			IV. 1783—1815.
54	802	Pitt, especially 1783-1793.	55	805	Regency Crisis, 1788.
56	808	Fox and Nelson: Public Careers.	57	809	French Revolution and England.
58	818	Anglo-Irish Union: Account.	59	819	Catholic Emancipation: George III.
60	828	Peace of Amiens, 1802-3.	61	829	Four Episodes: Connexions.
62	838	Five Naval Battles: Selection.	63	839	Six War Incidents, 1793-1815.
		V. 1815—1832.			V. 1815—1832.
64	844	Three Episodes: "Six Acts," etc.	65	843	Social Discontent after the War.
66	848	Navarino: Circumstances.	67	849	Canning and Castlereagh.
68	856	Religious Toleration: George IV.	69	857	Catholic Emancipation: Peel, etc.
70	858	Ten British Statesmen: George IV.	71	859	Industrial Revolution.
72	860	Parliamentary Reform: Abuses.	73	861	Parliamentary Reform: Struggle.
		VI. 1688—1832.			VI. 1688—1832.
74	974	Chief Jacobite Attempts.	75	975	Ten Party Names, 1688-1832.
76	978	Acts of Parliament: George III.	77	979	Parliamentary Reform: Delay.
78	982	Two Parliamentary Unions: Terms.	79	983	The Two Unions: Circumstances.
80	986	List of Wars in Century XVIII.	81	987	Second Hundred Years' War.
82	990	Notable Events in each Reign.	83	991	Marlborough and Wellington.

*Notice.—The pages distinguished by asterisks are issued separately, printed on one side of the paper only, and sold in packets at the following rates, prepaid and post-free:—12 copies, 8d.; 20 copies, 1/- The bibliographies, etc., enumerated above under pp. 1-20, can also be had separately in four-page leaflets (3d. each). The publishers will be pleased to entertain proposals and furnish estimates to teachers or lecturers in History desiring to have any pages supplied in a modified form to meet the needs of special classes.

[Pages 1-8, 11-16, 19 also appear in Book D.]

Lindsey G

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 550 549 2